

A
DEFENCE OF
THE TRVE SENCE
AND MEANING OF THE WORDS
OF THE HOLY APOSTLE

Rom. CHAP. 4. ver.

3. 5. 9.

In an Answer to sundry Argu-
ments gathered from the forenamed
Scriptures, by Mr. *Iohn Goodwin*: which an-
swer was first dispersed without the Au-
thors name, but since acknowledged
By Mr. *George Walker*.

Together with a reply to the former
answer; or, Animadversions upon
some of the looser and fouler
passages thereof.

By *IOHN GOODWIN*, Pastor of
Colemanstreet London.

*To every time there is a season, and a time to every pur-
pose under the heaven, Ecclesiastes 3. 1.*

*A time to weepe, and a time to laugh; a time to mourne,
and a time to dance, verse 4.*

A time to keepe silence, and a time to speake, verse 7.

*A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of warre, and a
time of peace, verse 8.*

Published by a lover of the truth and peace.

Printed in the yeare 1641.

DEFENCE OF THE TRUE SENSE AND MEANING OF THE WORDS OF THE HOLY APOSTLE

Rev. C. H. R. D. N.

1889

In an answer to sundry signs
many gathered from the forenamed
scriptures, by Mr. John Gresham, which an-
swers are fully illustrated within the Au-
thor's name in the forenamed book.

Together with a reply to the former
by Mr. John Gresham, which an-
swers are fully illustrated within the Au-
thor's name in the forenamed book.

Published by George W. Gresham, Publisher,
10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

The following is a list of the names of the
persons who have contributed to the
publication of this work, and who have
been instrumental in its being brought
to the notice of the public.



To the Reader.

Epistles of this nature, are unusually wel' d up to their proper bulke with large commendations, either of the workes, (to which they are prefix) or of their Authours, or of both. I intend to waue this custome, though having a sure foundation, and fitting materialls, to build as sumptuous a structure in this kinde, as others have done in the like cases. Yet thinke not, that this intension proceeds from an unwillingnesse to pay that tribute of praise, which is justly due to the name of any man: I acknowledge the equitie of the Apostles precept, ^a to render honour to whom honour doth belong: it comes rather from an indisposition, publicly to meddle in this great controversie, (wherein the whole world stands engag'd) viz to whom this golden apple is to be given; on whose head this crowne of honour is to be set. Whom one man approves, another dislikes; whom a third doth reverence, a fourth disdaineth: and such is our weakenes, and partialitie in judging, that no perfect agreement can be expected, till the ^a revelation of the righteous judgement of God, who shall render to every man according to his deedes. I shall not therefore endeavor to steale away the heart of any man, after the Authour of the Reply, or his opinion, by speaking high and excellent things of him: all that I will say, is onely this, I wish him as much honour and respect from the world, as hee is worthy of, which (I am perswaded) is more then he looks for, and as much as his greatest adversary can justly challenge: but to give in the full estimate, or precisely to set downe, what is his due above his fellowes, I am unwilling, but far more unable; yet something I could doe this way, and I can hardly resist the strength of my provocations hereunto, but I forbear; not that I dread Mr. Walkers thunderbolts, to be censur'd by him as a rude

^aRomans
3.7,8.

^aRomans
2.5,6.

To the Reader.

impudent, Socinian Sectarie: but because I desire that Mr. Goodwins reputation might be rais'd in none, by any other engine, then by a real and evident conviction of his deservings: for though to thinke well of those we know not, is counted charity; yet to applaud, and admire any, upon no surer ground then the generall vote, is folly, and may prove dangerous: the wombe of our times hath beene too abundantly fruitfull with instances hereth: many have we seene cast upon perplexing inconveniences, and some yoked with desperate errors, and that by those whose persons they have ignorantly wondered after. And I am perswaded, that many tenents in religion (which are now confidently given, and greedily received as wholesome foode) would hardly downe, were they not wrapt up in the sweet fame of such or such mens names. I would not that Truth her selfe were entertained upon such termes: certainly she accompts none her true subjects, but those onely, who are brought under her scepter, by the love of her commanding beauty; not by the parts, learning, holinesse of her choysest agents. Concerning the Reply (here presented to thy consideration) I gather thus much from the Authours words: that it was a worke of recreation, not of labour; and therefore no marvell, if it came into the world with a smiling countenance: and though in this respect, it may be judged by some unlike its father, who is of a wonderfull grave and sober temper; yet upon a strict view, many of his lyncaments are to bee seene in the face of it; I meane, soundnesse of judgement, quickenesse of wit, fairenesse of carriage, yea and mercy too towards his adversary: for had he stricke him in every place, where hee found him naked; hee had left him so blacke and blen, that even Mr. Walkers friends would hardly say, this is hee. If any shall except, against the manner of managing this warfare,

a Vid
Preface.

To the Reader.

warfare, and censure his expressions as too light, to hold out with the weightinesse of his matter; I referre such for satisfaction to his owne preface. As far as I understand, no wiser course can be taken, to charme downe the spirit of anger into sobernesse, then to deale with it in a pleasant way: whether M^r. Walker doth strongly sympathie with this turbulent passion, none will question, but such as are strangers to his dealings: and I verily beleieve, when the Authour put his Reply into this dresse, he had respect to him alone, to whom he privately sent it, not once deeming (as I conceive) that ever it should be look't upon by so many, and such iudicious eyes, as it is now likely to fall under. For it is probable, that neither he nor M^r. W. when first they joyned their heads and pens together for the framing of these Tracts, intended to scatter them abroad by the hand of the presse. Indeepe M^r. Walker when he received the Reply, promised the messengers to print both that, and his owne Answer; which had bene faire, and worthy the man, he would bee taken to be. But while the performance thereof was expected, he brings into the world, a confused medley of the strangest Secianisme and Christianisme, that was ever heard of. By what figure hee will bee able to salve the breach of his promise, I cannot guesse; though hee hath forc't them to doe him service (as hee conceives) elsewhere, yet I much feare they will here all faile him: for through the whole compasse of that his discourse, I can here nothing of the Reply; I confesse he onely mentions a scurrilous Lybell fraught with lies, forgeries, absurdities, contradictions, blasphemies, sent forth under the name of a Reply: but I can hardly perswade my selfe that he would so farre abuse the world, as to make it beleieve, that by this Lybell hee meanes M^r. Goodwins Rep'y. But if his passion so farre transported him beyond his in-

To the Reader.

tellectualls, as to charge so innocent a peece with such capitoll crimes; I pittie the man; and expect its discharge from the hands of such as are not infected with so mortall an enemy unto reason. Nor hath hee kept touch with his promise about his owne answer: for though the most part hereof may bee gathered from thence, yet is it made so unlike to what it was, by adding something, and subtracting others; that in consideration hereof, it was thought requisite, to print it in that very shape, in which it came at first from betweene his hands, (for to this alone hath the Reply reference) and to couple both it and the Reply in one volume.

I am conscious of no other designe, that the publisher propounded to himselfe, but onely this: to cleare the Reply and the Authour of it, from those false and foule imputations of lying, forging, &c. and to wash off from the face of that truth, they pleade for, those blacke coullers of Socinianisme, and Arminianisme, which Mr. Walkers penicill hath drawne over it; that appearing to the eye of the world out of his cloathing; their innocency might bee acknowledged in the judgements and consciences of reasonable men. The accomplishment of which designe, will (I dare say) satisfyingly recompence his cost and labour; and enlarge his heart towards the God of peace and truth, who hath given successe to so just, so pious, so commendable an undertaking.

Farewell.

An

AN EPITOME OF M^r.

Walkers Answer.

OR

A speciall receipt by a moderne Divine against the Dangerous infection of an Orthodox Truth.

REcipe 21. folio's or leaves of papyrus, as close written as may well be read. *Sofinus* and *Arminius* well beaten together, and strained through a course boulder of an English discourse: A handfull of good Scriptures carelessly gathered, and well steeped in the standing water of a new laid interpretation. Add hereunto two or three Hebrew roots: of reading a sufficient quantity: of Learning about a third part: Of the hearb called *αψιλαδηνος* in English lack-love, 6 leaves (at the least) of blacke tongue-wort some fiftene slips: of tropes and metonymies gathered where they never grew as many as you can come by: of the drugg called *diabolico-pseudo-lobetico* 12 ounces: of the simple called insultory or assafetidea as much: of the sweet and savory hearb discretion, halfe a scruple.

Let all these bee made up into the body of a discourse and swallowed downe without chewing upon a full stomacke, and take heede of drinking any sound interpretation after them, and there is little feare that the truth will ever doe you any harme.

Probatum est.

Reader, if thou had'st rather take a little paines, then be angry; I desire thee to releive the Printer with thy pen, and to reforme thy Booke, before thou readest it, according to these subsequent directions.

In the Preface.

Page 9. line 5. for, *serapp.* r. *serap.*
 p. 11. l. 1. for, *present* r. *pleasant* l. 18.
 for *amptious* r. *amptuous*.
 p. 12. l. 25. for, *passages* r. *pages*.
 p. 13. l. 13. for, *diserologie*, r.
aifcbrologie.
 l. 14. for, *messenger*, r. *messenger*.
 l. 15. for, *magnificent*, r. *magnificent*.

In the discourse.

p. 6. l. 31. for, *corponeris*, r. *componens*
 p. 8. l. 29. for, *opinion any*, r. *opinion*,
that any.
 p. 13. l. 13. for, *Divinity (who, r.*
Divinity at Leyden (who. ibid.
for, of judgement, r. of that
judgement.
 p. 15. l. 22. for, *urge a little*, r. *urge*.
A little.
 p. 20. l. 10. for, *defended here*, r. *de-*
fended, &c. Here.
 l. 18. for, *word, discourse*, r. *wor-*
die discourse.
 l. ult. for, *too* r. *to*.

p. 22. l. ult. for, *misperifar*, r. *mis-*
prison.
 p. 26. l. 13. for, *our*, r. *owne*.
 p. 29. l. 27. for, *no satisfaction*, r. *no*
sub satisfaction.
 p. 32. l. 15. for, *this is, r. is this*.
 p. 33. l. 27. for, *first* r. *fullest*.
 p. 34. l. 20. for, *saitb* further, r. *saitb*
be further.
 p. 37. l. 24. for, *skill*, r. *still*.
 p. 40. l. 33. for, *promises*, r. *premisses*.
 p. 43. l. 2. for, *justification* r. or *free*
justification.
 p. 47. l. 9. for, *bibobular*, r. *triobular*.
 p. 48. l. 19. for, *black, in so, r. so black*
and.
 p. 55. l. 26. for, *neighbours* r. *neigh-*
bour.
 p. 59. l. 33. for, *mee*, r. *men*.
 p. 65. l. 25. for, *contradiction*, r. *con-*
traditions.
 p. 70. l. 2. for, *belived*, r. *beleeving*.
 p. l. 10. for, *not for* r. *not of us for*.
 p. 74. l. 2. for, *to speak*, r. *to speak to*.
 p. 86. l. 12. for, *interpre*, r. *interpre-*
tesse.
 p. 95. l. 37. for, *censured* r. *conceived*.



A
D E F E N C E
O F T H E T R U E
S E N C E A N D M E A N I N G
of the words of the holy Apostle

R O M . 4 . v . 3 . where it is said, that *Abraham* beleeveth G O D , and it was counted so
him for Righteousnes : and v . 5 . to him that
beleeveth his Faith is counted for Righte-
ousnesse : and v . 9 . for we say that
Faith was reckoned to Abraham
for Righteousnes.



THE true sence and meaning of the holy
Apostle in these speeches, according to
the common judgement of the most
godly, learned, and judicious Divines of
the best Reformed Churches, is this;
That upon *Abrahams* beleeving the
Promise of God, that God would be his shield, and ex-
ceeding great reward; and that God would raise up out
of his loynes the blessed Seed (*Christ* the Redeemer;) in
whom all the Elect and faithfull of all Nations being
gathered

gathered unto *God*, and by one Spirit Baptised, and united together into one spirituall body with him their spirituall head; and made lively and sensible partakers of his perfect *obediance*, *righteousnesse*, and full satisfaction for *redemption*, *remission of sins*, *justification* and perfect *salvation* should become *Abrahams* faithfull seed, and partakers of the same reward, and should wee more seeke the reward of *blessednesse*, by the *righteousnesse* of their owne workes, performed according to the tenour of the *Law* in every mans owne person, but in the *Lord Iesus Christ* who is the *Iehovah Zidkenu*, the *Lord* our *righteousnes*, and *God*, the lot and portion of every true beleever; upon *Abrahams* beleaving of the *promise*, and firmly without staggering applying to himselfe this *blessing* promised, and upon his full perswasion that *God* who promised out of his free *grace*, was by his power able to performe though he by course of Nature, and by reason of the deadnesse of *Sarahs* wombe, seemed and indeed was incapable of that *blessing*; *God* the *Lord* counted this to him for *righteousnesse*, that is, accepted and accounted him for a *righteous* man, as indeed he was not for any *workes* of his owne, or by any *righteousnesse* performed in his owne person according to the *Law*, but by the *righteousnesse* of *faith*; that is, the *righteousnesse* of *Christ* apprehended and applied by *Faith*, for being thus justified by *faith*, and having this Communion with *Christ* of his full satisfaction and *righteousnesse*, *God* becomes in *Christ* our sheild and exceeding great reward.

The Corrupt exposition of the Apostles wordes, by the Hereticke Socinus, and his followers the Arminians, and other fanaticall Sectaries.

They all hold and obstinately affirme, that *Abrahams* beleaving and his *faith* (taken in a proper literall sense

sence without any trope) was counted to him for *righteousnes* instead of all *righteousnes*, which either *Abraham* him selfe in his own person, or any surety in his owne person, or any surety in his behalfe, could performe to the *Law* of *God*; And upon these words thus wrested; they build all their hereticall *Doctrines* and opinions, concerning *justification* of the faithfull before *God*, to wit; First, that *faith* as it is in every *beleever* a gift of *God*, even as it is inherent in him, and is his owne *faith* and beleeving, is the onely thing which *God* of his grace and mercy, and out of his absolute soveraigne power, and dominion is pleased to ordaine, appoynt, and account for all the *righteousnesse* which a man shall have for his *justification*, though in truth and in strictnesse of the *Law*, and according to the rule of *justice* it is no *righteousnes*; being weake oftentimes and full of infirmities.

That the spirit of *God* by the *Apostle* in these words, did not intend or meane any of the Communion of the *righteousnes* and perfect obedience performed by *Christ* to the *Law* as our surety and in our stead, nor any imputation of that *righteousnes* to every true *beleever* for *justification*, nor *Gods* accepting of the faithfull for righteous by their communion of that *righteousnes* applied, possessed, and enjoyed by *faith*.

By *faith* and beleeving they doe not understand that gift and worke of *Gods* spirit in the elect regenerate, and sanctified, by which they doe beleeve and are perswaded that they are in *Christ*, and *Christ* is their head, and they as members have communion of all his benefites, even of his full satisfaction and perfect *righteousnes* for remission of all their sinnes, and for justification; and by this perswasion and beleeving they have a sweet and lively sence, feeling and fruition of *Christs* satisfaction and *righteousnes*, and rest on them as on the covering and propitiation of their sinnes, and their *righteousnes*

by which they stand righteous before God and are justified; but by *faith* and *beleeving* they understand no more but a confidence in God: that he will performe his *promises* made in *Christ*, and an assent unto his word that it is true; the tenour of which word and *promises* they conceive to be this, that *Christ* in his pure perfect humane nature, by his *righteousnes*, sufferings and *obedience* unto death, hath merited such high favour with God. that God in honour to him, is pleased to accept and account the faith of them that beleeve him to bee a sufficient *Saviour*, for *righteousnes*, and requires noe other *righteousnes* to constitute them, and make them after any sort formally righteous in their *justification*.

4

When they acknowledge that *Christ* his perfect satisfaction and *righteousnes*, is the meritorious cause of our *justification*, they doe not meane, that *Christ* his satisfaction and *righteousnes* are communicated to us, and by *faith* so apprehended and possessed that wee thereby are indeed, and in Gods account righteous before God and are justified, and they deserve that hee should to account us for them, but this is their mind and meaning that *Christ* by his *righteousnes*, and *obedience*, hath merited that God for his sake should account *faith* to us for *righteousnes*; without either our owne *workes* of the *Law*, or his *righteousnes* imputed to us, and made ours by communion, and when they say, *faith* is imputed for *righteousnes* as an instrument: they meane not as the spirituall hand or instrument, applying *Christ* his *righteousnes*, to bee after a sort the formall *righteousnes* of the *beleever*, but that *faith* as it is the instrument by which the *beleever* doth beleeve that *Christ* hath purchased this favour, that *faith* should be the onely thing accounted to him for *righteousnes*.

The Orihodoxe Exposition I will prove and confirme from the wordes of the Apostle himselfe ; and other strong Arguments in the first place ; and afterwards will confute and overthrow the Hereticall Exposition.

The true Exposition defended.

FOR the right understanding of the *Apostles* wordes three things are first to be considered and explained : First, what is here meant by *faith* and beleeving. Secondly, what *righteousnes* is here meant. Thirdly what is meant by imputation.

By *faith* in this place wee must not understand that naturall habit, and power which is common to all reasonable men, who upon their knowledge of things spoken or promised, doe give willing assent unto them that they are true, either for the Authority of the speaker, whom they doe respect and judge to bee faithfull : or because they see good reason in the things spoken and promised, and if the things promised tend to their owne good, they rest upon them confidently, and perswade themselves that they are sure and certaine of them already, or shall receive and enjoy them in due time without faile. But here, by *faith* we are to understand that supernaturall giift and grace of beleeving wrought in the elect, regenerate by the *spirit* shed on them abundantly through *Iesus Christ*, *Tit. 3: 6.* which is therefore called most holy *faith*, *Iude 20.* this *faith* agreeeth with the other in these foure poynts.

First, as that is an habit and power of beleeving, so is this, secondly, as that contains in it, *notitiam in intellectu*, a knowledge and notice of the things spoken & beleeved; so doth this; And as that contains in it *assensum in voluntate* an assent of the wil, so doth this also; And as that *faith* when it goeth no further is called historical;

4.

so this also : And as that *faith* when it reacheth to good things promised to our selves particularly, to apply them and rest on them, hath also *fiduciam in corde & affectionibus*, a trust and confidence of the heart and affections in it; so hath this also, and is cald a firme perswasion, trust, confidence; but they differ in divers things. First that is a naturall power or habit. This is spirituall, wrought in men by the *Spirit of God*, dwelling in them and uniting them to *Christ* in one mysticall body. Secondly that hath in it no knowledge but naturall arising from light of naturall reason, nor any assent of the will or confidence in the heart and affections; but such as are drawne, stirred up, and wrought, by meanes of naturall light and common causes; this hath in it a *spirituall* knowledge arising from the spirit of *God*, enlightning the understanding; the *Spirit* also enclines and moves the will to give assent, and confirms the heart with confidence and firme perswasion. Thirdly that is common to all reasonable men; This is proper to the *elect, regenerate, and sanctified* by the holy *Ghost* shed on them through *Christ*; and is the first and the radicall grace and vertue of renovation. 4. That hath for the object or things beleaved, either naturall and worldly things onely, or things heavenly and supernaturall, seene and discern'd through the darke mist of naturall reason and assented to, & rested on with a carnall and un-sanctified will and heart. This hath for the object, things supernaturall, and heavenly and spirituall, discerned by supernaturall light, assented to with an holy and sanctified will: confirmed to the heart by a *spirituall* fence: and sweet taste of the things promised, wrought by the holy *Spirit* in the true beleever, apprehending and applying them.

But to come neere to the *Text*, the beleaving which the *Apostle* speaks of in the 3. *verse*, and also in the 9. and 22. *verses*, is the *faith* and beleaving of *Abraham*, who divers yeares before this beleaving which is said

said to be counted to him for *righteousnes*, was called out of his owne Country : and by *faith* obeyed Gods calling, and went and sojourned in the Land promised to him and his seed, as appeares *Heb. 11. 8. 9.* he had overcome and slaughtered foure mighty Kings, and their victorious armies by *faith* and *confidence* in Gods promises; and *Melchizedeck King of Salem the Priest of the most High God*, had blessed him (as we read *Gen. 14.*) and after these things the Lord appeared and spake to *Abraham* and said, feare not, *I am thy shield*, and thy exceeding great reward, and withall hee renewed his promise of the blessed seed, by meanes of which seed all the families of the Earth should be blessed in *Abraham*, and should become his faithfull children; besides his naturall seed and posterity which should come of the Sonne and Heire of his owne bowells, as appeares *Gen. 15. 1. 4.* These were the promises which God made to *Abraham*, and which *Abraham* beleevd to be true, and resting upon the Lord by firme *faith* and belief for the performance of them, the Lord counted it to him for *righteousnes*, *Gen. 15. 6.* or, as the *Apostle* expresseth the same sentence in the same sence, though in wordes somewhat different, it was counted to him, *verse 5.* even *faith* was reckoned to him for *righteousnes*, *verse. 9.*

Now this *faith* and beleeving was first an holy spirituall beleefe: and the *faith* of a man long before called of God, and sanctified by his Spirit, and made obedient to God and his word. Secondly, It was a beleefe not only of the promise of *Christ* the blessed seed in generall; but more specially that *Christ* according to the flesh, should come out of his owne bowells; and that by *Christ* the Sonne of God made man of his seed, the redemption both of him, and of all his faithfull seed, that is, all true beleevers should be wrought and performed, Gods wrath appeased, the Law fulfilled, Justice satisfied, perfect *righteousnes* brought in for their justification, and by

by his and their union with *Christ* by one spirit, and Communion of all his *benefits*, they should have *God* for their portion and reward, for their *shield* and defence and should not need to seeke the blessing, and reward of eternall life from their owne *workes*, or their owne *righteousnes*; and fulfilling of the *Law* in their owne persons, but meereley from the free *grace* of *God*, and of his free giust in *Christ*, as a reward of *Christs* *righteousnesse* freely given to them, and of them apprehended by faith and beleeving. Thirdly, this faith of *Abraham* was not a weake, but a strong *faith*, and belief without staggering, even a full perswasion, that *God* who quickneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as if they were, and was able to make good, and to performe what hee had promised; yea it was a beleeving in hope against hope; that *God* could out of a dead body and womb raise up a lively *seed*, and make them spiritually righteous: who are by nature and according to the *Law* wicked sinners. All these things are manifest by the places before cited, *Gen: 15.* and by the expresse wordes of the *Apostle* in this chap: from the tenth *verse* to the end of the Chapter. And thus you see what is meant by *faith* which is here said to be counted for righteous.

Secondly, the *righteousnes* here meant is not the *righteousnes* which is according to the strictnesse and tenour of the *Law*; that is, *righteousnes* of a mans own *workes*, performed by every man in his owne person to the *Law* of *God*; for the *Apostle* doth dispute altogether against that *righteousnes* and proves, that neither *Abraham* was iustified or counted of *God* righteous for it, as appeares in the 2. 5. 6. 13. *verses*, nor any other at any time, as appeares in the Chapter before. And *Chap. 8. 3.* and 9. 32. 10. 3. But here is meant an Evangelicall *righteousnes*, which doth not consist in any worke or workes performed by a man himselve in his owne person, nor in any grace or vertue inherent in himselve;

selfe, but is a *righteousnesse* which God of his owne free grace doth impute to the true *Beleever*; who by one *Spirit* is united to *Christ*, and hath communion with him, and is called the *righteousnes of Faith*, and doth exclude legal *justification*, by *righteousnesse* of a mans owne *works*, as appeares in the whole discourse of the *Apostle* in this and the former Chapter, and in diverse other places of this *Epistle*, especially *ver. 13.* of this 4 *Chap.* and in *Chap. 3. 27. 28.*

Thirdly, the phrase of *imputing*, or counting a thing to one signifies both in the Old and New Testament, an Act of judgement and estimation, by which a thing is judged, esteemed, reckoned, and accounted to be as it is indeed, and then it is *just*, and according to *truth*: but when a thing is counted, or judged, thought, and esteemed, to be as it is not, then it is *unjust*, and not according to *truth*. Now Gods thoughts are alwaies *just*, and his judgement is according to *truth*. *Rom. 2. 2.* And therefore a *lust imputing and counting*, is here ment, for God doth account, and Iudge of all persons, and things, so as they are. Of *unjust counting*, and *imputing* falsely, we have some examples in *Scripture*, as 1 *Kings 1. 21.* where *Bathsheba* saith to *David* *I and my Sonne Solomon shall be counted offenders*, that is, *usurping Adonyah and his wicked Company, will so esteeme and judge us*: of *reputing*, and counting truly as the thing is, we have examples also, as *Nehemiah 13. 13.* where it is said of the chosen *Levites*, that they were counted *faithfull*, viz. upon former experience of their *faithfulness*, and therefore the Office of distributing to their Brethren, was counted to them. And *Levit 17. 4.* where it is said, *Blood shall be imputed to that man he hath shed blood, and shall be cut off from among his people.* And *Psal. 22. 30.* *a seed shall serve him, it shall be counted to the Lord for a generation.*

Moreover, this word *impute* or *count*, signifies sometimes in the most proper sense a bare Act of the Judgement and thought, as *Pro. 17. 28.* where a *Foole* is said

to be counted wise when he holdeth his peace ; that is, men for the present judge or thinke him wise , at least in that point of *silence*.

Sometimes it signifies in a more full sense, not onely *thinking, Judging, and counting persons* to be good or bad, just, or unjust, innocent, or guilty ; but also dealing with them, and using them accordingly, as in the places before named, 1 *Kings* 1. 31. *Nehem.* 13. 13. and *Levit.* 17. 4. and *Psal.* 22. 30. also 1 *Sam.* 23. 15. where *Abimelech* purging himselfe before *Saul*, from the offence of conspiracy with *David* against him (as *Doeg* had falsely accused him) saith, *Let not the King impute anything unto his servant*, that is, Let him not thinke or judge his servant *guilty*, nor deale with him, or use him as a Conspiratour.

Sometimes it signifies by a Metonymie of the *cause* for the *effect*, condemning, and punishing an offence in a guilty person as he hath deserved, and to deale with him and use him as hee is justly thought and judged to have deserved, as 2 *Sam.* 19. 19. *Shimei* said, *Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto me* : he doth not desire that *David* would not thinke, nor judge, nor count his *iniquitie* to be no *iniquitie*, that had beene against all reason, but that for the *satisfaction* which he had made, in coming first of all to the house of *Joseph* to meet *David*, and to bring him againe to his Kingdome, *David* would graciously pardon his offence, and not proceed against him, and punish him as justly, and worthy of punishment.

Sometimes it signifies by a Metaphor, to count one thing as it were another, or no better then another, or of the same value, as *Prov.* 27. 14. where a flattering salutation or blessing, given with a loud voyce, is said to be counted a *Curse*, that is, esteemed no better then if it were a *Curse*.

Sometimes to use one, as if he counted him of another Condition, as *Gen.* 31. 15. where it is said of *Laban*, *that*
be

he counted his Daughters strangers; that is, used them as if he had counted them strangers: and *Iob. 31. 10.* where *Iob* saith, that God counteth him for his enemy; that is, afflicteth, and plagueth him, as if he counted him an enemy.

Sometimes the word signifies to *score up*, or to put upon a mans account or *reckoning*, either the *effence* or *debt* which he himselfe runs into; as *Rom. 5. 13.* where it is said, that *sinne is not imputed when there is no Law*: that is, it is not *scored up*, that men are punished for it, and it is not judged and punished in them, or the *debt* which he takes upon him for another: as *Philemon verse 18.* *If he hath wronged thee, or is indebted to thee put that on mine account, that is, impute and count it to me, and set it on my score.*

Now the severall significations of the severall wordes being thus laid open, I proceed more particularly to the true sense and meaning of every word in these speeches, and to shew how far the speeches may be extended. And first, by *Faith*, and *beleeving* which is counted to every true beleever (and was counted to *Abraham*) for *righteousnesse*. I understand here (according to the judgment of the most Orthodox Divines) the true holy spirituall *faith*, and *beleeve*, which is before shewed to have bin in *Abraham*, and which is proper to the elect regenerate, and is said to be *imputed to them for righteousness*: By *righteousnesse* is here meant *Evangelical righteousness*, (which is opposed to the *legal righteousness* of *works*, which is *inherent* in every man, and is every mans fulfilling of the *Law* in his owne person) even the perfect satisfaction and *righteousnesse* of *Christ*, (*God and man*) our mediator and surety which he the *Son of God*, in mans Nature performed to the *Law*; and which is apprehended by every true beleever, and applied to himselfe by a lively *faith* and whereof he hath communion and is truly made partaker by his *Spirituall union* with *Christ*, of whose mysticall body he is a member, being

Baptized and engrafted thereinto by one Spirit. By the *imputing* and *counting* of that *faith* for *righteousnesse* to *Abraham*, and to every one of his *faithfull seed*, is here ment *Gods* setting of *Christs* *righteousnesse* on the skore, and putting it on the account of every true *beleever*, and and his judging, esteeming, and counting them no more guilty of sinne, but perfectly *righteous* by that *Evangelical* *righteousnesse*, which is called the *righteousnesse of God*. 2 Cor. 5. last ver. because it is the *righteousnesse of God*, performed in our Nature, and the *righteousnesse of faith*, and not of *workes*, because the *faithfull* obtaine, and enjoy, and apply it by *beleeving*, and not by working the *workes of the Law*. Rom. 4. 11. 13. For the confirmation of this exposition, and justifying of this *truth*, we need seek no further *Arguments*, but such as may be gathered from the Apostles owne words, as in other of his Epistles, so especially in this to the *Romans*.

The first argument is drawne from the wordes of the *Apostle* in the second chap: of this *Epistle*, verse 26. where this word λογισθησεται (as it signifies) to be *imputed* or *counted*, is first used; If (saith hee) the *uncircumcision* keep the *righteousnes* of the *Law*, shall not his *uncircumcision* bee counted for *Circumcision*? by *uncircumcision* (in the first clause) we cannot understand the *foreskinne* of the *flesh* not cut off, it is most absurd, and against common sense and reason to thinke or to suppose that it can or could performe and keepe the *righteousnes* of the *Law*, but by *uncircumcision* is ment a *Gentile* not *circumcised*, as *Beza*, (the most learned, judicious, and accurate Critik and searcher out of the sense of every word and sentence in the new Testament) doth expound the word, and so we have in this word a Metonymie of the adjunct for the Subject: The same word in the second clause (as *Beza* also well observes) doth not here signify the *foreskin* or *uncircumcision* in a proper sense (for that cannot but most falsely be reputed and counted for

circumcision; because they are contradictories one to another) but the state and condition of him who is *uncircumcised*, even the outward state of Gentilisme; and here is another Metonymie of the same kind, even the signe put for the thing signified, yea it signifies not the state of a Gentile or *uncircumcised* man barely considered in it selfe, but as comprehending in it the *righteousnesse of the Law*, which the man *uncircumcised* hath kept and performed in that state, as the words necessarily imply; for the Apostle doth not here suppose onely *uncircumcision*, but the observation of the *righteousnesse of the Law* in the state of *uncircumcision*; and so here is a Metalepsis or double trope, even a metonymie also of the thing conteyning for the thing contained, that is, of the Subject for the adjunct, and also of the cause for the effect; that is, the man in the state of *uncircumcision* keeping the *righteousnes of the law*, for the *righteousnes of the law* by him performed. By *circumcision* we cannot understand the outward cutting away of the foreskin of the flesh, neither taken literally and carnally, as the corrupt Jewes did take it, for a worke of *righteousnes and obedience* to the *Law* for *justification*, so it was an *obligation*, by which the *circumcised* was bound under pain of cutting off for ever to performe the whole *Law*, as appeares *Gal. 3.3*. And for a *righteous* Gentile to be brought under this bondage was no benefit, but a miserable condition; neither can *circumcision* be here taken sacramentally, as it was an outward signe and *scale of the righteousness of faith*, and of *Mortification*, and of all *vertues of Holinesse* by which men are *sanctified to God* and become his *peculiar people*, for *Ismaels Esau* and all the prophane persons of *Israel* *circumcised*, were partakers of the outward *signe and Sacrament of circumcision*, and yet were destitute of the *inward Grace signified*; And in neither respect can *uncircumcision*, or the person *uncircumcised*, nor Gentilisme, together with the keeping the *righteousnes of the Law* be counted truly for *circumcision*, nor reckoned in the

place of it; But here by *circumcision* is meant the *circumcision of the heart* in the *Spirit*, and not in the *Letter*, for so the *Apostle* doth expound himselfe *verse 29.* the (word *λογισμὸς* shall be counted) signifies here in a full sence *judging, counting, approving, accepting and using accordingly.*

Now all laid together the meaning of the *Apostle* in these wordes is this, that if a man *uncircumcised* doe keepe all the Commandements, and performe the *righteousnes of the Law*, his state of Gentilisme comprehending in it the *righteousnes of the Law*, shall be counted and accepted for the state of an *holy and righteous man circumcised in heart*, and hee though *uncircumcised in flesh*, and a Gentile in *outward estate*, shall be counted of God a *true Israelite without guile*, truly *circumcised with inward spirituall circumcision of the heart* in the *spirit*, whose praise is not of men, but of God. This sence and meaning of the wordes, and of this phrase is so cleere and manifest, and so perfectly agreeable to all true reason, that none can deny it, unlesse hee will set himselfe to rebell against the light; and this phrase being the same which this *Apostle* doth use againe, where hee mentions counting and imputing of faith and beleeving for righteousness to *Abraham*, and to every true beleever, doth give light for the discovering of the true sence and meaning of the wordes, the phrase being the very same. Wherefore if we will follow the *Apostle* himselfe, and tread after him in the same steps, being the surest guide, and best expounder of his owne wordes and meaning, we must by *Abrahams beleeving* by a *Metalepsis* or double trope, with our learned Divines, understand *Abraham standing in the state of a true beleever, united by one spirit unto God in Christ, and having communion of his satisfaction and righteousness, which were of force from the beginning to save and iustifie, and to make God the reward of the beleever.* And by faith imputed or counted for righteousness, wee must not understand faith in a proper sence, but

but by a double *trope*, for the state and condition of a true faithfull man, and for that which faith comprehends and includes in it, even the perfect righteousness and full satisfaction of Christ God and man: By righteousness we must understand the state of a man justified, or Evangelicall righteousness communicated to the justified man, and made his for justification. And by counting and imputing we must understand the accepting, approving, esteeming & iudging of Abraham, and every true beleever, so soone as he appeares faithfull to be in the state of a man justified, and Gods setting on his skore, and counting, & imputing to him being faithfull, the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, which is indeed and in truth made his by spirituell union and communion with Christ.

Hear then the true paraphrase upon the Apostles words, shewing the true sense and meaning of them, Abraham upon a true inward spirituell sense of his union and communion with Christ, did beleieve and was surely persuaded that God was his reward, and this his beleefe and faith comprehending Christ for righteousness, and containing in it after a sort the righteousness of Christ, God counted it to him for righteousness; that is, set it on his skore, and reckoned it to him for justification, and judged, esteemed and accepted him for a man truly righteous, as indeed he was, and so whosoever doth not rest on his owne workes for justification, nor seeketh thereby to be justified, but by faith seeketh that righteousness which makes him righteous by the communion of it, when in himselfe by nature he is ungodly, his faith comprehending in it Christ and his righteousness, is counted for righteousness, because it settles him in the state of a righteous man; and Gods setting on his skore Christs satisfaction and righteousness, doth accept him for a man justified.

A second argument confirming the exposition is drawn from the Apostles owne wordes in the fourth verse: now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt, whereby it is manifest that the thing counted

counted for *righteousnes* brings with it a *reward*, also to the *beleever* which is counted, not of debt, but of *grace*; now there is nothing which can bring the *reward* of *eternall life*, and *Glory* to a *beleever*, when it is counted to him and set on his *score*, but the perfect *righteousnes* and *satisfaction* of *Jesus Christ*; that, all grant to bee meritorious of *eternall life* to all that are partakers of it, and because the *communion* and *imputation* of it is of *Gods free grace*, and the *faith* by which we receive, apply and enjoy it, is *Gods free gift*, therefore the *reward*, to wit, *eternall life* is of *free Grace*, and not of debt, as the *Apostle* here saith. Whereupon the the Conclusion follows, that the thing counted for *righteousnes* is the *righteousnes* of *Christ* apprehended by *faith*.

Thirdly, in the 6. and 7. *verses* the *Apostle* teacheth expressly; that the thing *imputed* by *God* is *righteousnes*; and such a *righteousnes*, as being *imputed*, brings *forgivenesse* of iniquity, and covers *sinnes*, and so makes the *beleever* blessed. Now there is no *righteousnes* to be found among all mankind, besides *Christs* perfect *righteousnes* and full *satisfaction*; and that is a perfect *propitiation* for all *sinnes*, and an *expiation* of all iniquity to them who by *faith* have put on *Christ*, therefore it is the true *righteousnes* which is *imputed* to every *beleever* for *justification*.

Fourthly, that which is here said to be *imputed* to *Abraham*, and to every *beleever*, is for *righteousnesse* to *justification*, for the discourse of the *Apostle* here, and in the 3. and 5. *chap.* is altogether of *justifying*, as appears *chap. 3. verse 20. 24. 26. 28. 30.* and also *chap. 5. 1. 16. 18, 19.* in all which places he mentions *justification* and *justifying*; And here in this 4. *chap.* he brings *Abrahams* example, and *Dauids* testimony to shew how we are *justified*: now there is nothing which doth serve to us for *righteousnes* to *justification*, but that which is found in *Christ* our *Mediatour*, even his *righteousnes* and perfect fulfilling of the *Law*; so this *Apostle* doth plainly

plainly affirme and teach *chap. 5. 19. and chap. 8. 3. 4. and Chap. 10. 3. 4.* Therefore this *righteousnes* is upon the true *beleeving* of *Abraham*, and the faithfull counted and imputed to them, and set on their skore for their *iustification*.

Fifthly, that *exposition* of a phrase or speech of *Scripture*, which is warranted by other places of *Scripture*, wherefore that *phrase* is used, is to be judged the best *exposition*; this none can with any reason deny, for the *Spirit* of *God* speaking in *Scripture*, is the best expounder of his owne meaning. Now this *exposition*, that *imputing* or *counting* a thing for *righteousnes*, is no more but declaring a man thereby to be *righteous*, and giving him the Testimony of *righteousnes*, is warranted by other *Scriptures* wheresoever it is used. Therefore this is to be judged the best *exposition*.

For confirmation of the *assumption* or *minor* we have that place of holy *Scripture*, *Psal. 106.* in which onely and no where else, a thing is said to be *imputed* or *counted* to a man for *righteousnes*; viz. *Phineas*, his godly zealous act of executing judgement on *Zimri*, and *Casbi*, then *Phineas* stood up (saith the *Psalmist*) and executed judgement, and that was counted to him for *righteousnes*, now no man can understand, that this act was accepted of *God* for *righteousnes* to *iustification*, for then a man may be *iustified* before *God* by one godly and zealous act of his owne, which is that which the *Apostle* utterly condemneth for a grosse error, and bends his whole discourse against it. The true sense and meaning of this phrase is no more but this, that *Phineas* performing such a godly zealous act, as is proper to a faithfull *righteous* man onely, who hath the *Spirit* of *regeneration*, and of *sanctification* dwelling in him: uniting him to *Christ*, and making him by faith a true partaker of *his* *righteousnes*, *God* upon this act gave him the Testimony of *righteousnes*: and declared him to be a *righteous* man truly *iustified*. Therefore the

phrase of imputing or counting faith for righteousness, signifieth no more but this, that the true *believer* is counted a *righteous* man, and God giveth him the Testimony of *righteousnes*, because he is indeed partaker of *Christs righteousness*, which he hath apprehended and applied by *faith*. If I should insist upon humane testimonies, and the opinions of Orthodox *expounders* of these wordes both ancient and *moderne* for the further prooffe of this *expofition*, a large volume would be titlle enough for the particular rehearsing of them all, let these five arguments suffice.

The Confutation of the false expofition made by Socinus, and other Hereticks his Disciples; as Wotton, Goodwin, and their Companions.

First, whereas they hold, that *faith* in a proper literal sense; that is, considered in it selfe without relation to any other thing, is counted to every true *believer* for *righteousnes* to *iustification*, and God requirerth in and of us, no other thing for *righteousnes*, neither our *workes* performed in our owne persons, according to the *Law*, nor *Christs* perfect *righteousnes*, and fulfilling of the *Law*, made ours by *spirituall union* and *communion*, and accepted of God for us. This I prove to be false, hereticall, and blasphemous by these Arguments following.

First, *Faith taken in a proper sense, is a part of our conformity and obedience to the Law of God, which above all things requires that we give honour to God, by believing him and his word, and trusting in him as our onely Rock, and the God of our strength and salvation. They therefore teaching, That faith in a proper sense is counted for righteousness, do teach, that we are iustified by a worke of obedience to the Law performed in our owne persons, and that this is the onely righteousness which God requires any way of us*
for

for iustification: Therefore their opinion is hereticall, more impious then the Pelagian and Popish Hereses concerning iustification.

Secondly, that which was imputed to Abraham, and is imputed to true beleevers, is righteousness, so the Apostle affirms, ver. 6. and 11. But faith is not righteousness taken in a proper sense, for righteousness is a perfect conformity to the Law, as sinne is transgression of the Law: Therefore faith in a proper sense is not righteousness.

Thirdly, that which chargeth God with error, and falsehood, in his iudgement, is blasphemy.

This opinion, that God counts faith for righteousness, that is, thinketh, iudgeth, and esteemeth it to be righteousness taken in a proper sense, chargeth God with error and falsehood, in his Iudgement; Therefore it is blasphemy.

If they pleade, that God by his soveraigne power, may graciously count that which is not righteousness, for righteousness to the beleever: I answer, that God by his soveraigne power, cannot ly, nor erre, nor Iudge unrighteously, it is contrary to his infinite and eternal Iustice, which wil not be satisfied without fulfilling of his iust Law, and perfect righteousness communicated, and imputed to us: Therefore this is a base shift, and wicked pretence, devised to cover their blasphemy, by that which is indeed, a greater blasphemy.

Fourthly, that opinion which denyeth, and taketh away the meanes by which God is revealed to be infinitely Iust, mercifull, and wise, and makes the satisfaction of Christ and his perfect fulfilling of the Law, a vaine and needlesse thing, is most Hereticall, impious, and blasphemous.

This opinion, that God by his soveraigne power can, and doth count, and accept, faith in a proper sense for righteousness to Iustification, without imputation of Christs satisfaction, and righteousness, takes away these meanes, and makes Christs fulfilling of the Law, a vaine and need-

lesse thing. Therefore it is an *impious hereticall and blasphemous opinion.* The meanes by which God is revealed to be *infinitely Iust, mercifull and wise*, are these: Namely, First, that he cannot be reconciled to man without a full *satisfaction* made to his *iust Law* by mens *surety* in their stead, and by him *communicated* to them, and made theirs as truly as if they had fulfilled the Law in their owne persons, and though the *satisfaction* be of *infinite value*, yet it cannot profit them till they have *communion* of it, and be *partakers* thereof: this is that which reveales God to be *infinitely Iust*, and that his *infinite iustice* being so *strict*, he would *mercifully* give his owne Son to become *man*, and in *mans* nature, to make such a full *satisfaction* for *men*, and by his *Spirit* shed on them through *Christ*, would *unite* them unto him in *onbody*, and *communicate* him with all his *benefits* and *satisfaction* to them, to be truly *theirs*, and to *satisfy* for *them*. This reveales his *infinite mercy, bounty, and wisdom*: And by these meanes, this opinion takes away *Gods iustice*; while it sets *God* forth to be such a one as can dispence with is *iustice* and accept *faith* in a proper sense for *righteousnes* which is no *righteousnes*, but onely a weake imperfect *worke* and *duty* which we owe to the Law. If *Gods iustice* may thus be dispensed with, and a weake thing in fraile man, counted for *righteousnes* without any *communion*, or *imputation*. What need was there of *Christs Death, suffering, and obedience*; *God* might as well have accepted the sacrifice of a *Lamb*, or the suffering and *obedience* of a meere man, and so the full *satisfaction* of *Christ* is vaine and needlesse, and it was want of *wisdom* in *God* to spend so much of *Christs blood* and *obedience* in vaine, when by his *soveraigne power* he might have accounted a lesse thing for *mans ransom*. Therefore this opinion is *blasphemy*.

Fifthly, that opinion which overthrowes the *sacraments* of the *Gospel*, and the true use of them, is *hereticall* and *blasphemous*.

This

This opinion, that *Christs righteousness* and *obedience* is not *imputed* to the *faithfull* doth so; for the *Sacraments* are *seales* of our *communion* with *Christ*, and the *Lords Supper* rightly received, is called; the *communion* of the *faithfull*; and when these hereticks deny, that the *righteousnes* of *Christ* is *imputed* to the *faithfull*, they deny their *communion* with *Christ*, for if *Christs righteousness* be *communicated* *spiritually* to them, and made theirs, *God*, whose *judgement* is according to *truth*, cannot but *impute* it to them, and set it on their *score*, and count it theirs in his *true* *Judgment*: If he should not count it theirs, and *impute* it to them, he should judge unjustly, and erre in his *Judgement*; and the *Sacraments* which are *Seales* of *communion*, are lying *Seales*, if it be not *communicated* nor *imputed*. Therefore this opinion is *hereticall* and *blasphemous*.

Sixthly, that opinion which is *invented* and *maintained* by Hereticks, who deny the *eternall God-head* of *Christ*, and tends to perswade men, that there is no use of *Christs* being *God* and *man* in *one person*, is *Hereticall*, and *blasphemous*. This opinion is such, and tends to take away the use of *Christs* being *God* and *man* in *one person*; and to perswade men there is no use of his being *God* and *man* in *one person*; for all *Orthodox Divines* teach that it was necessary *Christ* should be *God*, that the *obedience* and *suffering* of his *man-hood* for a time might be the *suffering* and *obedience* of *God*, and so of infinite value, and of more worth then if the *elect* had suffered for ever in *Hell* in their owne *persons*, and that the *fulfilling* and *obedience* of *him* alone in our nature, should be of more value then if they all in their owne *persons* had *suffered* and *obeyed* as much as he did; They also teach, that the *satisfaction* and *righteousnes* which *Gods* infinite *justice* required, and without which it could not be *satisfied*, for the removing of so great an evil as *Gods* infinite *wrath* and *eternall death* and *torment* in *Hell*, and for the bringing in of *eternall righteousness* & making men worthy

of, and fit for *eternall glory in Heaven*, which is an *infinite good*, could not be performed by any but by *him*, who is *God and man in one person*: And therefore the *infinite evil* which was to be taken away by *Christs suffering*, and the *infinite good* which was to be procured by his *obedience, and righteousness*, required necessarily, that he should be *God and man in one person*. But the authors of this opinion, by denying that *Gods infinite justice* stands in *strength* and requires such a *satisfaction*, or that every *believer* hath need to have such a *satisfaction communicated* to him, made his by *spirituall union*, and *imputed* to him, they take away the use of *Christs God-head*, and the causes and reasons for which it was necessary that he should be *God*, and in conclusion they deny *Christ to be God*. Therefore this opinion is *Hereticall* and *Blasphemous*.

Lastly, that opinion which is builded on *Hereticall* and *blasphemous grounds*, and is maintained and upheld by *blasphemous Arguments*, which shake and raze the maine *foundations* of true Religion, is most *Hereticall* and *blasphemous*: And such is this opinion; for it is builded upon this *blasphemous ground*, That *God by his Sovereigne power, may do and will, things contrary to his Justice*; that is, *count, and accept* that for *righteousnes*, which is not *righteousnes*; nor worthy to be counted one Act of *perfect righteousness*, (for such is the faith of fraile man taken in a proper sense) The arguments by which it is commonly maintained, are also *blasphemous*, viz. That *Christs righteousness is not the righteousness of true believers, neither is it imputed to them by God for Justification*: for they say, *God cannot Justify one by the righteousness of another*, and therefore he cannot *Justify us*, by *Christs righteousness*. What is this but an expresse deniall of the *union of the faithfull with Christ*, for if he be one with us, and we with him, then are *our sinnes* made his, and in him satisfied, and his *righteousnes* made ours, and we are *Justified by it*, as it is ours, and not the *righteousnes*

ourses of another, nor so different from us; but that he and all his benefits are ours, and we have interest in them, and enjoy and possess them so far as every one hath need of them.

Secondly, they argue, that the righteousness of one cannot be sufficient for all the elect, nor counted to them all for righteousness, which is in effect a denying of Christ to be God and man in one person, for if they acknowledge him to be God, they must needs acknowledge, that his righteousness and fulfilling of the Law, is of more worth and value, then if all men in the world had fulfilled the Law in their owne persons, without sayling in one point.

Thirdly, they argue, that if Christs satisfaction and righteousness be made ours, and imputed to us, that the Law may be said to be fulfilled in us, and we may be said to have satisfied Gods Justice in and by him our surety, and our head, then is there no place left for pardon and free forgiveness of our sinnes, for pardon and satisfaction are contrary. By which they overthrow the Doctrine of redemption, and of Christs satisfaction, and deny Christ to be our redeemer, and to have payd our ransom, and made a full satisfaction for our sinnes to Gods Justice contrary to the Scriptures, and the Iudgement and beleeve of all Christian Divines, which teach, that Christ hath payd our ransom, and made a full satisfaction, and so is properly our redeemer: and though Gods Justice exacted of Christ our surety, a full ransom, and did not abate to him the least farthing of our debts, yet we are freely pardoned, and have free forgiveness, and are freely iustified by Gods grace, because he did freely give Christ to satisfy and fulfill the Law for us, and doth freely by his grace, and by the free gift of his Spirit, unite us to Christ, and make us partakers of his satisfaction, and imputing his satisfaction freely to us, doth for it freely forgive our sinnes, and iustify us.

Fourthly, while they argue, that faith in a proper sense is all the righteousness which the faithfull have for Justification

cession, and yet dare not affirme that *faith* is any *formall righteousness*, but deny that any *formall righteousness* is required in *iustification* : Hereby they deny the Saints *iustified* to be *righteous*, contrary to the *Scriptures*, which call the *faithfull iustified*, the *righteous*, and the generation of the *righteous*, which they cannot be without a *formall righteousness*, which doth *constitute* and give being to a *righteous* and *iustified* man, as he is *righteous* and *iustified*; wherefore this is a monstrous opinion, contrary to common sense and reason.

Fifthly, while they deny, that the *faithfull* are *constituted* and made *formally righteous*, by the obedience of *Christ* communicated, and *imputed* to them, (which the Apostle in expresse wordes doth affirme. *Rom.* 5. 19. and 8. 4. and 10. 4.) they fall into the heresie of the Pelagians, and are forced to deny that *Adams sinne*, and *disobedience* is communicated, and *imputed* to his posterity, and they are *formally sinners*, by it; And rather then they will yeeld, that Infants which die before they commit *actuell transgression* in their owne persons are by death punished, because they are *guilty* of *Adams sinne*, they do *blasphemously* affirme, that God being offended, and moved to wrath by the *sinnes* of Parents, will out of the magnificence of his *Iustice*, destroy *Innocent Babes*, with their *sinfull Parents*, which is contrary to Gods word and Law, teaching us, that Children shall not die for the sins of their Parents, unless they be partakers with them, either by *communion* and *imputation*, or by *imitation* and *approbation*; whereas they bring for instance, that the Children of *Korah* were destroyed with their Father, though they were *Innocent*, and not partakers in the *sinne*; herein they contradict the *Scriptures*, which expressely affirme, that the Children of *Korah* dyed not. *Num.* 26. 11. for they upon *Moses* his threatening, escaped, and fled from their Fathers Tents in all likely-hood, and onely they perished, who would not be admonished by *Moses*; to separate from the Congregation of *Korah*,
but

but adher'd to him, & wer partakers of his conspiracy & sin.

Sixty, when they for a colour of their *heresie* confesse in word, *that Christs righteousness is the meritorious cause of justification*, and yet deny *communion*, and *imputation* of it to *beleevers*; they fall into this horrible opinion; That *Christ by his righteousness, doth iustifie Infidels, and impenitent Reprobates, as much as he iustifies the elect, and faithfull* : For if it be not communicated and imputed to *beleevers* in their *iustification*, then have they no more interest in the merit thereof, then *Infidels, and damned Reprobates* ; it is onely *meritorious*, and of worth, value, and sufficiency, to *iustifie* them, s it is to all mankind, even to *Infidels* ; and what *benefit*, and merit of it they have, it is by their owne free will making use of it, which *Infidels* might do if they would, for they have the merit of it as much as *beleevers*, can have without *communion*, and *imputation* of it.

Lastly, while they argue, that as in the first covenant, God required workes of the Law performed by every man in his owne person, and this was the condition which man was to performe for obtaining of life, and that covenant of life was not free, but conditionall; so in the new covenant, God requires in us faith and beleeving, as the condition which we on our part must performe for *iustification*, and so for the obtaining of eternall life and salvation. Hereby they affirme the new covenant, to be a covenant conditionall, and not of free grace, for whatsoever is covenanted and promised upon a condition to be performed, is not absolutely free, nor freely given, and so the faithfull are not iustified freely by grace : whereas they plead, that *iustification* and life is promised upon condition of beleeving. (If you beleeve you shall be saved) This is a grosse and absurd mistake, for every conditionall proposition doth not propound the condition of a covenant, for that whensoever it is performed, makes the thing covenanted a due debt, which the promiser is bound to give : But oftentimes a conditionall proposition propounds the means by which

a *free gift* is *received*, or the *qualification* by which one is made capable and fit to receive and enjoy a *free gift*: As for example, it is often said in Scripture, *If you will heare, and hearken, ye shall be saved, and not destroyed, your Soules shall live, and ye shall eat the good of the Land.* *Isay* 1. 19. *Ier.* 26. 3. and 35. and many other places. *If we love one another, God dwelleth in us.* *Ioh.* 4. 12. *If we walke in the light, we have fellowship one with another.* *1 Ioh.* 3. 7. *If we confesse our sinnes, he is faithfull and iust to forgive.* *1 Ioh.* 1. 9. *If a man be iust, and doeth which is right, he shall surely live.* *Ezek.* 18. 5. 21. in all which and the like places, there is no condition of the covenant propounded, but onely the *meanes* and the way to receive *blessing* or the *quality* and *condition* by which men are made capable and fit to enjoy *blessing*; and sometimes the *effects*, and *fruits* of them that are in a *blessed estate*; and even so, when the Scripture saith, *If ye beleue, you shall be iustified*: there is no condition of the covenant propounded to be performed on our part for *iustification*, and *salvation*, but onely the *qualification* by which God doth qualify us, and fit us by his *free grace* to be *iustified*, and *saved*, and the *meanes* by which he enables us to receive *righteousnes*, and to lay hold on *salvation*, which is freely given to us in *Christ*.

Vpon these particulars severally observed out of their owne wordes and writings, I strongly conclude, that this opinion being builded upon such *blasphemous* and *hereticall groundes*, and maintained and upheld by such *blasphemous arguments*, must needs be most *impious*, *hereticall* and *blasphemous*.

Having already proved the *Socinian*, and *Arminian* opinion to be most *false*, *impious*, and *hereticall*, and *blasphemous*, I proceed to discover the *weaknesse* and *absurdity* of *Mr. Goodwins* Arguments, contained in the 3 Chapter of his *Socinian* discourse, which he hath attempted to publish in Print (as I heare.) which argu-

ments

mons I am challenged to answer, and for that purpose he hath with his owne hand delivered them to me: Against which I cheerefullie set my selfe, and stand for the *truth*.

The maine ground upon which he pretends to build his *Arguments*, by which he labours to prove *imputation* of *faith* in a proper sense, for *righteousnesse*, and that *faith*, and not the *righteousnesse* of *Christ* apprehended by *faith* is counted for *righteousnes*, is the 4th Chap: of the *Epistle* to the *Romans*.

Before his disputation he professeth, that none by any wit or learning under Heaven, is so fit to determinate what is *imputed* for *righteousnes* in *iustification* as the *holy Ghost* speaking in the *Scriptures*; and yet he saith, *he leaues his meaning and intent* in many things, unto men to *debate*, which they onely can declare to whom he reveales the secret of his counsell, and amongst these being the true begotten of the *truth*: he seemes to intimate, that he will prove himselfe to be one, by some *Stamp* or *supercription* of a *rationall authority*, set upon him, though in common esteeme he be but like other men, and the nearer he is to the *truth*, the farther off he is from the approbation of many men, greatest pretenders to the *truth*.

Though the rude multitude of his Disciples give just offence, by proclayming him to be the great *light* of *Gods Church*, revealed in these last times; yet in him it is more *scandalous* and *offensive*, that he, professing the *holy Ghost* to be the best *judge* for determining *controversies*, doth immediately contradict himselfe, by saying, *that he leaues his meaning and intent, to be debated by men*, and makes such men as himselfe (stamped with a *rationall Authority*) the judges of his meaning: What is this, but the *heresie* of the *Arminians*, who hold, *that their right reason*, (as they call it) and not the word of the *spirit* speaking plainly in the *Scriptures*, is the best *Judge* of the *spirit*s meaning and intent in *obscure places*, and how

scandalous, and offensive it is for him to profess such excellent things of himselfe before hand, and in the whole progress of his *disputation* to run so far from the *Spirits* meaning, and from all *right reason* (as I shall prove by my sitting, and answering of his *Arguments*) I leave to the Godly wise, and learned to Judge.

His first Argument.

Argu. **F**irst, he undertakes to prove, That faith in a proper sense is affirmed by the Apostle to be imputed for righteousness, and not the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, Because the phrase of imputing faith for righteousness is once, yea twice, yea a third, and fourth time used by the Apostle in this Chapter, and therefore hath all the Authority and countenance from the Scriptures that wordes can give, whereas the imputation of Christs righteousness hath not the least reliefe, either from any sound of wordes, or sight of letter in the Scriptures.

Answer.

Ans. **I**n this Argument he shewes himselfe as bold in affirming manifest untruthes, as ignorant both of *Rhetorick* and *Logick*. In *Rhetorick* it is counted an excellent ornament of speech to continue a trope, and it is called an *Allegory*, (he is ignorant who knoweth not this.) In *Logick* he is counted a bold lying *Sophister*, who holds that a *Syllogisme*, a true and perfect Argument hath a proposition which is manifestly false. And what more grosse ignorance in *Logick*, then to hold two propositions to be negative and affirmative, in respect of one another, which consist of divers subjects, and that an affirmative and the negative may both be true. All these absurdities appeare in this Argument.

First, in that he affirms the Apostles speech to be proper, and the sense to be properly *literall*, because he useth

useth the same phrase foure times : hereby he shewes his *Ignorance* of the continuance of a trope, which *Rhetoricians* esteeme an elegant *Allegory*, and which is most frequent in the *Scripture* : For *Jer. 26.* the Lord is said to *repent* 3 severall times, viz. *ver. 3. 13. 19.* and yet the speech is not proper, but improper : for God cannot properly be said to *repent*, as appears *Num. 23. 19. 1 Sam. 15. 29.* Here then he sheweth as much *Ignorance* of *Rhetoricks*, and of the frequent use of rhetorical *Allegories* in the *Scripture*, as he seemes to shew of *Logick*, when he makes his *affirmative*, viz. *Faith is imputed for righteousness*, and affirms it to be true, and withall saith, that the *negative* inseparably accompanying it, is a truth also, when *Logick* teacheth, that if the *affirmative* be true, the *negative* must needs be false. If by the *negative* he means this, viz. *Christs righteousness is not imputed*: He erres two waies from *Logick*, first by calling the *negative* inseparably accompanying his *affirmative* : Secondly, by speaking ambiguously, a speech which may beare divers senses ; which *Logick* abhorres in a *disputation*. Secondly, he shewes himselfe a bold lying *Sophister*, when he affirms most falsely, and impudently, That no truth in Religion, nor article of our faith, can boast of the *Letter*, that is, of the proper *literall sense* of the *Scripture* more full, expresse, and pregnant, then that speech or *proposition*, which is foure times used in one Chapter, For the contrary is most manifestly true, as divers places shew, where one and the same thing is often *affirmed*, and yet the speech is not proper, but tropicall : I will instance in one place which is most convincing, viz. *Gal. 3.* where the word (*Faith*) is ten times used in an improper sense, for the word of *faith* the Gospel, as it is opposed to the Law carnallie understood, viz. *verse 3. 5. 7. 8. 9. 12. 14. 22. 23. 25.* Now the maine *proposition* of his *Syllogisme* being so manifestly false, his conclusion inferred from thence is certainly most false, viz. that this speech of Saint Paul (*Faith is counted for righteousness*)

is properly *literal*, and not improper and *trypicall*

2. Arg.

The second Argument couched under the other runs thus, if it be reduced into a *Syllogisme*. That which hath not the least releife either from any sound of wordes, or sight of letter in the *Scripture*, is an untruth and a meere *fiction*, the *imputation* of *Christs righteousness* hath not the least releife, either from sound of wordes, or sight of letter in *Scripture*. Therefore it is a meere *fiction*.

Ans.

The *Assumption* or *Minor* of this *Syllogisme* is most false, and therefore the conclusion hath no truth in it: I prove it most false by the *Apostles* owne wordes; for in the fourth v. he saith, *that to the blessed man God imputeth righteousness without workes*; and verse xi. where he saith, *that as to Abraham faith was imputed before hee was circumcised*, so God shewed, that *righteousnes* should be *imputed* to the *believing Gentiles* though *uncircumcised*, In which two places he shewes, that by *believing* and *faith* *imputed* to *Abraham* and all true *believers*, the Spirit of God meanes *righteousnes* couched under the name of *faith*, and *believing*. Now this *righteousnes* cannot be *faith* it selfe in a proper sense; for every act of *faith* is a *work*; but this is a *righteousnes* *imputed* to us without *workes* done by us in our owne persons, besides *faith* and all the *believing* of the most *faithfull* cannot make up one *day*, or *work* of true and perfect *righteousnes*; such as God can *impute* to *justification*, for *faith* in the best *believers* (even in *Abraham* himselfe) was stayned with many doubtings & fears. But here must needs be meant that *righteousnes* in which the most just God can see no imperfection, and therefore counts it for *righteousnes* to *justifie* all that are partakers of it; And this can be no other but the *righteousnes* which *Christ* God and man performed in mans nature, therefore the contrary of the *Assumption* is most true.

3. Arg.

The third, which hee calls his second mayne Argument or prooffe, is drawne from the scope of the place; and the intent of the *Apostle* in his discourse of *justification*, here in these

these Chapters of this Epistle, it runs thus being reduced into a Syllogisme. The scope of the place, and intent of the Apostle, is to hedge up as it were with thornes the false way of justification which lay through workes, and to put men by from attempting any going that way: and also to discover the true way of justification, to them; that is; to make knowne unto them; what they must doe, and what God requires of them for justification, and what hee will accept at their hands, instead of the workes of the Law, and that is it which he here saith, is imputed for righteousness. Now faith and beleeving in the proper and formall signification is that which they must doe and performe to their justification, which also God requires of them instead of the workes of the Law, and will accept at their hands instead of them. Therefore it is faith in a proper sense which is here by the Apostle to be counted for righteousness.

Ans. In the first proposition we have an heape of lyes mixt with contradiction, first, in that he saith, the scope of the Apostle is to put men from the false way of justification which lies through workes; and to discover the true way by making them know what they must doe, and performe for justification; here like a mad or drunken man he contradicts himselfe, for, who doth not see that the way of doing and performing is the way which lyes through workes, and that if a thing done and performed by us be counted for righteousness to justification, then the way of justification lies through workes done by us: which if they be iust and lawfull, are workes of the Law: Secondly, if he by the way which lay through workes understands mens owne workes done in obedience to the Law of God; it is true which he saith; that this is the false way; and that which hee calls the true way; viz. by mens doing and performing, is either the same with it, or else worse; and so hee speakes a most grosse untruth, in calling it the true way, being the same with the false way; but if by the way which lies through workes

worker he meanes seeking after *Christs righteousness* which consists in *works* of obedience to the *Law*, then his wordes are most false, wicked and blasphemous, in that he calls this the false way to *justification*.

Thirdly, in that he saith, *God* requires something to be don, and performed by men for their *justification*, and that is it, which the *Apostle* saith is *imputed* for *righteousnes*, this is most false, neither doth the *Apostle* intend any such thing in this place, for this is to set up *justification* by doing, and *works* of our owne, which he altogether opposeth, and his whole scope is bent against it; and to shew, that all which we are to looke to, is to receive that which is freely given of *God*, and *imputed* to us for *righteousnes*, that is, the *righteousnes* of him who is *God*; as he often calls it in this *Epistle*, as *Rom. 3. 21.* and *10. 3.* here then behold how hee makes the new *covenant* a conditionall *Covenant*, and not of free *grace*; promising *justification* and *salvation* upon condition of mens doing.

In brieft, besides the contradictions and other absurdities and untruthes in this *Argument* before noted, I finde these grosse errors in the carriage of it, One is; in that he saith, *God* doth not require of us the *righteousnes* of *Christ* for *justification*, this hee required of *Christ* himselfe.

To which I answer; that *God* requires nothing of us for our *justification*, for wee are *justified* freely by his *grace* through the redemption that is in *Iesus Christ* *Rom. 3. 24.* that is, by the free gift and communion of the satisfaction which *Christ* made for our redemption; but yet the thing which *God* requires in our behalfe, is that satisfaction and *righteousnes* of *Christ*, and the qualification of us for the receiving; applying and enjoying of that *righteousnes* for *justification*, is *faith*, which is not of our selves, but is the gift of *God*, *Ephes. 2. 8.* for *God* worketh in us the will and power to beleve, and actually beleevving also, *Phil. 2. 13.* and all this by his spirit dwelling

dwelling in us uniting us to *Christ*, and so bringing us to communion of all his benefits, even of his *righteousnes* to *iustification*: and this is the true intent and scope of the *Apostle*, to draw us from seeking *iustification* by any *worke*, which we can doe, or which *God* requires of us for that end, and to make us looke up to the *redemption* which is in *Christ*; and in his satisfaction apprehended by *faith* to rest for *iustification*: as for this phrase, of *Gods* requiring *Christs righteousness* of us, it is harsh and unfavoury, yea absurd; as if one should say *God* requires, that the particular and individuall act done by another, bee not done by him, but by us; which implies a contradiction; but this, that *God* requires the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, not for our justification, but of *Christ* himselfe; this implies, that *Christ* had need of *iustification*, and was bound to fulfill the *righteousnes* of the *Law* for himselfe; and favours of *Socinian* and *Samosatenian* Heresie which denies *Christs God-head*; for if *Christs* humane nature being from the first conception most pure, upright and holy, was personally united to his *God-head*, and so the Sonne of *God* and *Heire* of all things; who can doubt but that in himselfe he was worthy of all Glory, at *Gods* right hand from his birth, as his taking of our nature upon him was altogether for us, so his infirmities, sufferings, death, and continuance on Earth for the performance of all *righteousnesse* and *obedience* to the whole *Law*, was for us, and for all the Elect, who of old beleevd in him to come for them, and who now doe in beleev him exalted to Glory according to his humanity, to thinke or say that he had need to justifie himselfe, and to merit by his *righteousnes* the state of *Glory*, is in effect to deny that he was *God* infinitely worthy of all Glory, as he was the onely begotten Sonne of *God* and *Heire* of all things. Another grosse error is, that he calls *faith* and *beleeving* a thing don and performed by us, when as the *Apostle* affirms, and all Christians confesse, that our

believing and *faith* is not of our selves, but the gift of God, and the *works* and motion of his *Spirit* in us.

A third untruth and grosse absurdity or rather blasphemy is in the last wordes, where he affirms, that if the *Apostle* had said unto them, that they must bee justified by *Christ*, or by *Christ's righteousness*, this had beene rather to cast a snare upon them, then to have opened a dore of life and *salvation* unto them. Farre bee it from mee and all true Christians not to detest and curse with the curse of *Anathema Maranatha*, that mouth which proclaimes and obstinately maintaines, that teaching *justification* by *Christ*, and by his *righteousnes* is casting of a snare on men, and not opening a dore of life and *salvation* to them.

In the third place he layes down his arguments against the true *Orthodox* interpretation of Saint *Paul's* speeches, concerning imputation of *faith* for *righteousnes*, which interpretation he goeth about to overthrow, by severall circumstances or passages in the context.

I. Arg.

The first Argument reduced into forme runs thus, that the Apostle who desired to speake to mens understanding, should in the weighty point of justification, time after time, and often without ever explaining himselfe, or changing his speech, use so strange harsh and uncomely an expression, and figure of speech as is not to be found in all his writings, is a thing most unlikely and not to be believed: But this interpretation viz. Fathers upon him such an harsh expression, and figure of speech, without ever explaining of himselfe, as is not to be found in all his writings, saying, that faith or believing is imputed for righteousness time after time, without ever changing his speech, and meaning, that indeed Christ's righteousness is imputed, which was to speake rather that he might conceale his mind then reveale it. Therefore this interpretation layeth on the Apostle a thing incredible, and is false and not to be believed.

To the *Assumption* I answer, that it is an heape of *Ans.*
manifest and impudent lies. First, it is no harsh, strange,
and uncouth expression to use a *figure* of speech, and by
saith and *beleeving* to meane the state, or a man in the
state of a true faithfull *beleever*, and by *righteousnes*,
the state, or a man in the state of *righteousnes*, or of a
righteous man, and to say that *saith* and *beleeving* is
counted for *righteousnes*, meaning that the state of a
beleever having by *saith* spirituall communion with
Christ, is a state of *righteousnes*, and the man which
is in that estate, is *reputed* of *God* in the state of *right-*
eousnes, for this same expression and *figure* of speech,
the *Apostle* useth severall times in the foure last *verses*
of the 2. Chapter of this *Epistle*; where by *circumcision*
he understands *sanctification* of the heart in the *Spirit*,
verse 29. and also 26. and also a circumcised Jew, v.
27. and by *uncircumcision* he meanes an uncircumcised
Gentile, and also the state of *Gentilisme*, as *Beza* ob-
serves, and common sense teacheth; and here is disco-
vered a second impudent lye, in that he saith, this *fi-*
gure of speech is not to bee found in all the *Apostles*
writings. A third bold lye and manifest falshood is,
that the *Apostle* time after time useth the phrase of *saith*,
or *beleeving* imputed without ever explaining himselfe,
or changing his speech, for that which hee calls *saith*
and *beleeving*, and *saith* it is imputed in the third and 5.
ver. he explaining himselfe, and changing his speech both
in the 6. and 11. *verses*, calls it *righteousnes*, and *saith*,
God imputeth *righteousnes*, and *righteousnes* is imputed.

Thus you see how hee hath bent his tongue and pen
like a bow for lyes, and shootes them forth thick and
threefold like poysoned arrowes, as if his quiver were
the armory of the Father of lyers, the Prince of dark-
nesse.

The second Argument is briefly this, that which is im- 2. Arg.
puted for *righteousnes*, is called his *saith*, first before it is

imputed; verse 5. to him that beleeueth his faith is counted for righteousness; But the righteousness of Christ cannot truly and properly be called his; who is a true beleeuer before it is imputed. Therefore the righteousness of Christ is not here to be understood under the name of faith.

1. *Ans.*

The *righteousnes of Christ* by spirituall union and common with Christ: is as truly the true beleevers as his *faith* is his, for Christ is made unto him *righteousnes*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. and he is made the *righteousnes of God in Christ*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. and that in order of nature, before it is counted his *righteousnes*. For God, whose judgement is according to truth, doth not count that to the beleeuer which he hath not before, or at the same time doth communicate to him.

2. *Ans.*

Secondly I answer, that if *faith* which is here called (his *faith*) be *faith* in a proper sense, and bee *imputed* for *righteousnes*, then is man justified by his owne inherent *righteousnes*, and by a worke done and performed in his owne person, which is worse then Popery.

3. *Arg.*

The object of that *faith* which is here said to be *imputed*, is God himselfe, or the promise of God, and not the *righteousnes of Christ*: for to understand, that the *righteousnes of Christ* is meant by God, is to set up a trope, which is not a figure of speech, but a monster of speech. Therefore Christ's *righteousnes* is not here said to be *imputed*.

Ans.

The object of *Abrahams faith* was the promise of Christ, and that in Christ God was his shield and his great reward, Gen. 15. 1. Now no man can in beleeving by true *faith*, separate Christ's satisfaction and *righteousnes* from Christ himselfe: if he enjoy Christ by *faith*, he enjoys Christ's benefits also; and to beleeve God to be our reward, is to beleeve that God is become our *righteousnes*, and so our reward, for the blessed reward is the reward of *righteousnes*; and therefore this argument

ment rightly framed out of the 3. v. from *Abrahams believing God*, is strong against him; Here againe I note his ignorance in Rhetoricall tropes, in that hee saith, a double trope in one word, is a monster of speech; whereas Rhetorick calls it a *Metalepsis*, and counts it an ornament of speech. I here also observe his vaine tergiversation; for hee saith, that the Holy Ghost in the rehearsal of the things which belong to the object of faith and which are beleaved, doth never make the least mention of *Christs righteousness*; and immediately reckons many things which we are in *Scripture* required to beleave; amongst which is *Christ* himselfe, and the doctrine of *Christ*, and the promise of *Christ*, the testimony which *God* hath given of his Sonne; and the resurrection of *Christ*, every one of which includes *Christs righteousness*; for if we beleave in *Christ* aright, we cannot but beleave in him as a fulfiller of all righteousnesses; the Doctrine concerning *Christ* is, that he is made unctous of *God* righteousness; that hee is the end of the Law for righteousness to every beleever; The promise of *Christ* of old was, that *Christ* is the Lord our righteousness, *Ier. 23. 6.* and that he would cloath us with the Robe of righteousness, *Isay 61. 10.* the Testimony which *God* hath given of him is, that in him wee have eternall life, *1 Iohn 5. 11.* which is the reward of his righteousness, and therefore righteousness in him: His resurrection is the evidence of his righteousness and perfect satisfaction, as the *Scriptures* testific. And thus hee saith one thing, and after brings many *Scriptures* to confute himselfe; and at last grants what before hee denied; that *Christs righteousness* is to bee beleaved: Hee saith that some beleave *Christs righteousness* who beleave not *Christ* himselfe, which is indeed a Monster of Speech, Sense, and Reason. In a word, when the Spirit of *God* teacheth to beleave the righteousness of *God* for *Iustification*.

Romans 10. 3. and in many other places, which can be no other but Christs perfect righteousness, and satisfaction, as appears Rom. 3. 24. and againe, calls this righteousness, the righteousness of faith, he plainly shewes, that it is beleevd, applied, enjoyed, and possessed by faith.

- 4 *Arg.* *Christs righteousness can in no tollerable sense be called that faith whereby Abraham beleevd in God, that quickned the dead. Therefore under the name of that faith, it is not sayd to be imputed for righteousness.*

Ans. *God neither quickned Christ, nor raised him till he had fulfilled all righteousness, neither doth he quicken any dead, but through his righteousness, and by his Spirit, communicating it to them: and therefore under the name of such a faith, Christs righteousness is by a Metonymie said to be imputed.*

- 5 *Arg.* *Abrahams faith was that wherein he was not weake, neither doubted of Gods promise, ver. 19. 20. but Christs righteousness is not that faith, Therefore it is not here sayd to be imputed.*

Ans. *The more strong that Abraham was in faith, and far from doubting and staggering by unbelieve, the more firmly was he united to Christ, and had more full communion of his righteousness, and the more stedfastly did he stand in the state of a righteous man; and more justly might God count him for a righteous man. And therefore this Argument makes against him.*

- 6 *Arg.* *Abrahams beleevings that God who had promised was able to performe, was the faith imputed. But this was not Christs righteousness. Therefore Christs righteousness was not imputed.*

Ans. *The more that Abraham rested on Gods power and ability to performe, the more communion he had of Christs right-*

righteousnes, and the more justly did God count him for a righteous man, and impute Christs righteousness to him.

The faith which God imputes to us for righteousness, is 7 Arg. our beleeving him which raised Christ from the dead. But this is not Christs righteousness. Therefore it is not imputed.

Our beleeving in God who raised Christ from the dead, is our assurance that Christ had made full satisfaction for us, and therefore the righteous God who raised him up is satisfied for us, and hath accepted his righteousness to be our righteousness, and doth count us so beleeving, and applying it to be in the state of righteousness. Therefore this is for us and not against us.

The 8th. Argument is a bare affirmation, that to take 8 Arg. faith in a proper sense, is more plaine and cleare, and better beleeving the Apollle in this discourse, where he largely handles the point of justification: Therefore he here meanes faith in a proper sense, for that is more comfortable then to teach imputation of Christs righteousness.

The Apollle plainly expresseth, that faith imputed, is righteousness imputed. verse 6. 11. and it is more comfortable for us to rest on Christs righteousness, (besides which, there is no true and perfect righteousness to be found performed in our nature) then to build on faith, which in the best is mingled and stayned with many doubtings often times. Therefore the Apollle undoubtedly intends Christs righteousness, and so he doth expresse in plaine wordes, Chap. 5. 19. Chap. 8. 4. and Chap. 10. 4.

After these Arguments, he takes upon him to answer Arg. those places wherein the word faith and hope, are used to signify their objects, that is, the things beleeved and hoped for, and here he doth use notable tergiversation, and trifling.

mising. First, he grants, that the Apostle useth such *tropes of speech*, for indeed, it is undeniable. Secondly, he opposeth and saith, that the *habit of faith*, may be used to signifie the *object*, but not the *act*, whereas in the *examples named*, Gal. 1. 22. and 3. 23. and Colo. 1. 5. the *habit* and *act*, especially the *act of beleefe* and *hope* are to be understood, and indeed the Apostle doth name the *habit* as often as the *act* in this present *discourse*, where he saith, *faith is imputed for righteousness*.

Thirdly, he grants that the *act* sometimes may be put for the *object*, but then he flees to his *old shift* that *Christs righteousness* is not the *object of beleaving*, which I have before proved it to be:

Lastly, contrary to all *reason* he denies *Christs righteousness* to be the *object of faith*, as it is *iustifying*, whereas it is indeed the only *proper object* of it. Thus he shamefully trifles to shew his *impudency*, and *perversenes*.

The fourth way of Confirmation.

IN the fourth and last place, he undertakes to confirme his opinion by *testimony*, of learned Divines, both ancient Fathers and moderne writers, even from the *primitive times*, to the yeare 1500 after *Christ*: And here he confesseth, that he dares not upon his owne *reading* be confident, that they generally were of his opinion, but onely *resteth* upon another mans *testimony*, whom he nameth not: Belike, it was some *notorious*, and *infamous Socinian Heretick*, whom he is a shamed to name for his *Author*, and that his *confession* is not out of *humility*, and *modesty*, but out of *Satanicall subtilty*, to vent his *poysenfull lyes*, under the *person* of another, as the Devill did vent his by the Serpent, Gen. 3. I easily gather by his *impudent boldnesse*, in that, upon a lying report, he dares charge his *adversaries* with *calumny*, and *false report*, raised upon his opinion (unworthy the *tongue* or *pen* of *sober and learned men*) to make either *Arminius*, or *Socinus*, the *Authors*

thors of it ; and that he is not ashamed nor blusheth to affirme, that from the time of *Luther*, and *Calvin*, the fairest streame of *interpreters* runs, as to *water* and *refresh* his *interpretation*.

To the first I answer, That though the anciently condemned *Heretick Peter Anilard*, (who was gelded for his *incontinency*, by a man whose *Daughter* he had abused) layd the first ground of this opinion ; that *Christs satisfaction* is not imputed for justification, as *Saint Bernard* shewes, *Epist.* 190. yet the first *Authors* who expressly affirmed, that *saith* in a proper sense, without a trope, is by the *Apostle* sayd to be imputed for righteousness, were *Socinus*. *Part 4. Chap. 4. de Christo servatore*. and *Chap. 11*. And *Arminius* in *Epist. ad Hippolitum de collibus*. *Thes. 5*. And to his false pretence of the maine streame of writers, since *Calvin*, and *Luther*, running to refresh his interpretation, I oppose this challenge, that he cannot name one *Orthodox Writer* since that time, which ever held, that *saith* in a proper sense, is imputed for righteousness, and denyed the imputation of *Christs righteousness*. *Socinus*, *Arminius*, and that hereticall sect, are the onely maintainers of that opinion.

An Answer to all his Testimonies.

TO his *Testimonies*, and his impudent boasting, of the generall consent of *Interpreters*, I answer, first joyntly and in generall : That of all the *Testimonies* which he hath cited, there is not one which either affirms, that *saith* taken in a proper sense, is imputed for righteousness, or denyes the righteousness of *Christ*, to be imputed to us, and accepted of *God* for our justification; yea, that all *Divines*, who are the most zealous opposers of his interpretation may say the same wordes which his *Authors* say, and yet hold justification by *Christs righteousness*, imputed : yea, and in proving that truth may with good reason, presse the same wordes and speeches rightly understood

stood. So that a more odious example of *impudency* and *folly*, cannot be imagined, then he here makes *himselfe*, by making his *folly* and *absurdity* to strive for *Master-ship* with his *impudency*.

Secondly, for the particu'ar *testimonies* which he cites out of *Terullian*, *Origen*, *Iustin Martyr*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Primasius*, *Beda*, *Haymo*, and *Anselme*, and out of later Writers, to wit, *Luther*, *Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, *Calvin*, *Musculus*, *Bullinger*, *Gualter*, *Aretius*, *Ilyricus*, *Pelicanus*, *Humius*, *Beza*, *Iunius*, *Parent*: they are no more but what *Saint Paul* saith, and we all acknowledge and imbrace for *truth*, namely, that *Abraham* beleeving *God*, was counted a *righteous man*, and *saith* was counted to him for *righteousnesse*, and so are we all iustified, not by our owne *righteousnesse*, and *workes* of the *Law*, performed in our owne persons, but by *saith* counted for *righteousnesse*; for *saith* insted of our owne *workes*, layes hold on the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, and apprehending, and comprehending it, is counted for *righteousnes*, not in a proper sense, but as it comprehends *Christ* and his *righteousnes*, which *Calvin* calles apprehending the *goodnes* of *God*, and trusting in it; And therefore it is truly affirmed by *Iustine Martyr*, that *Abraham* obtained the *testimony* of *righteousnes*, viz. that he was a *righteous man*, not because of his *circumcision*, but becaufe of his *saith*; which wordes imply, That *saith* is not the *righteousnes* of the beleever, but the *evidence* of his communion with *Christ* in his *righteousnes* and satisfaction.

The *Testimony* which he cites out of *Musculus*, is expressly contrary to his *interpretation*; for the wordes are, *Commendat esse debebat hac fides, nō propria qualitatis, sed propositi Dei respectu*, that is, This *saith* ought to be commended, not in respect of the proper quality of it, that is, Not in a proper sense, but in respect of the purpose of *God*, wherby he hath appointed, that to beleeve in *Christ*, he wil impute it for *righteousnes*; *propter ipsum*, that is because of *Christ* himselfe, in whom they beleeve: By which

which wordes it is plaine, that *faith* is not *imputed* in a *proper sense* to the *beleever*, but in respect of *Christ*, in whom he *beleeueth*, and whose *righteousnes* he applies by *faith*.

The wordes which he cites out of *Aretius*, are also strong for us, against *himselfe*; viz. That *God* *imputed* *righteousnes* to *Abraham*, that is, so accepted his *faith*, that hereupon he counted him for a *righteous man*, by *imputative* *righteousnes*, which *righteousnes* cannot be any thing *inherent* (as *faith* and our owne *workes* are) but the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, besides which, there is no *righteousnes* to be found in all the world perfect and fit to *justify* man before *God*.

Illyricus his wordes are as plaine against him as our hearts can with, viz. That begging *faith* apprehending the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, is *imputed* to him in stead of his owne *righteousnes*: where note, that the reason why *God* doth *impute* *faith* for *righteousnes* is, because it apprehends *Christ's* *righteousnes*, not because it of it selfe in a *proper sense* is fit to be counted *righteousnes*: being but a poore begging hand, and being *inherent* in the *beleever*, which *imputative* *righteousnes* can in no wise be.

Thus in all his *testimonies* we have not one word to prove that *faith* taken in a *proper sense* is onely *imputed* for *righteousnes*, and not the *righteousnes* of *Christ*; But many *Testimonies* by him cited prove directly the contrary interpretation.

But because I will not have such a *forger*, and *false suborner* of *witnesses* goe away without the brandes of *forgery*, and *notorious impudency*; I will bring in the best learned of the *Ancients*, and also of late *Orthodox Divines*, even those whom he calls to witness for him, and make them speak in the owne wordes, and testify to all the world, That by *faith* *imputed* for *righteousnes*, they understand not *faith* it selfe in a *proper sense*, but the *satisfaction*, and *righteousnes* of the Lord *Iesus Christ*, *God* and *man*, performed according to the *Law* in our nature, and in our behalfe.

First *Iustin Martyr* testifieth, that we being in our selves wicked, and *ungodly*, cannot possibly become righteous, or be *iustified*, but onely in the *Sonne of God*, Δικαιωθήναι Δυνάτοϋ τοῦ εὐλόγου ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀσθελεῖς ἐν μόνῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Now if onely in the *Sonne of God*, and by *union*, and *communion* with him, (which all have, who are in him) then, onely by his *righteousnesse*; (For as the same *Author* in the same place saith) *It is his righteousnesse and nothing else which can cover our sin.* *Iustin Martyr. Epist. ad Diognetum.* And in his exposition of faith, he saith, *That Christ as well by his exact conversation of life; that is, his perfect righteousness, as by his undeserved death, hath abolished, and covered our fall and sayling, which came in by Adam.*

Irenaeus is so strict for our communion with *Christ*, in his obedience unto death, and for our reconciliation, and justification thereby, that he imputes *Christ's* obedience to us, and saith, *In secundo Adamo reconciliati sumus, obediētes usq; ad mortem facti.* Lib. 4. adversus Hæreses. cap. 14.

Athanasius in his 2 Tome, Pag. 270. of *Comelinus* edition saith, *That it is most necessary for us to beleve Scriptures, that Christ who hath freed us from the curse, is the first fruite of the masse of mankind, who are by him redeemed, and that the perfect fulfilling of the Law by him the first fruite, is imputed to the whole masse, his wordes are in Greeke, ἀπαλογίζεσθαι τῷ σφάματι.* And in his Booke of the Incarnation of the word of *God* he affirmeth, *that we shall live and be saved, because we are partakers of the righteousness without spot, which Christ, God in the flesh, brought into the World.*

Gregorie Nyssen, *Oration 2. in Cantic.* *Canticorum*, saith, *Christ having the sith or guilt of my sinnes, transferred upon himselfe, hath communicated his perfect purity to me, and made me partaker of that beautie which is in himselfe.*

Ambrose saith, *as Adam is the paterne of death, because of sinne, So is Christ the paterne of life because of his*
righte-

ousnesse, *Commentar. in cap. 7. Luca Lib. 5.*

Chrysostom saith, *If a few aske thee, how can all the world be saved by the righteous doings of one Christ? Thou maiest answer even so, as all the world is condemned by one Adams disobedience: cap. 5. ad Rom. Homil. 10.* That is, by the communion and imputation of them.

Cyrill saith, *Lib. 11. in Ioan. cap. 25.* Christ being the author of the Law; and yet subiecting himselfe to the Law by his obedience and righteousness, brings the blessing and life untous. And *Lib. de reſta ſide*, he saith, *It is absurd to thinke, that we should be made heires of the punishment of the first Adam, by his disobedience; and should not be made partakers of the righteousness of the second who doth bring us backe to life, by his most perfect obedience.*

Theodoret. *Sermo. 10. de curat. Grac. affectionum* saith. It is very convenient that he who so highly praised righteousness, should in his coming in the flesh fulfill righteousness for men.

Augustin. *Enchirid. ad Laurentium cap. 41.* saith, he was made sinne, that we might be made righteousness; not our owne, but Gods righteousness; not in our selves, but in him, even as he was sinne, not his owne sinne, but ours, not in himselfe, but in us: and in his 6. *Sermon. de verbis Apostoli*; God the Father (saith he) made him sinne, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Behold here two things, the righteousness of God, yet our owne; in him, not in our selves.

Leo the first: in his 70. *Epistle* saith, that by the innocency of one, we are all made innocent; and that by righteousness, derived unto men from him, who hath taken mans nature upon him.

Bernard in his 190. *Epistle* saith, as one hath borne the finnes of all, so the satisfaction of one is imputed to all; It was not one which forfeited, and another which satisfied: for the head of the body is one Christ: Also, in *Sermon. ad Milites Templi* he saith, Death is made to flee away in the Death of Christ, and Christs righteousness

ousnes is imputed to us. And a little after; he who hath willingly bin *incarnate*, willingly suffered, and beene willingly *crucified*, will he keepe back his *righteousnes* onely from us. And againe; *One man sinned, and all are held guilty*, and shall the *innocency* of one, viz. *Christ*, bee imputed only to one?

Anselme in *Rom. 5.* saith, that by the *righteousnes* of one comming upon all the *elect*, they come unto *iustification*, that they may bee *iustified* by participation of *Christs* *righteousnes*.

These with many other Testimonies which might be produced out of *Ancient Writers*, from the *Primitive* times untill *Luther*, doe abundantly shew, that they all by *faith* imputed, never dreamed of *faith* imputed in a proper sense, but only the *righteousnes* of *Christ* apprehended by *faith*.

But to descend to *Orthodox Writers* of this last age since *Luther*; It is well knowne, that they generally held *imputation* of our *sins* to *Christ*, and *Christs* *satisfaction* and *righteousnes* to us, to be the forme of *iustification*, by which *beleevers* are *iustified*.

Luther (if wee may beleeve his owne wordes) acknowledged that it was the Doctrine of *Saint Bernard*, concerning *iustification* by the *righteousnes* of *Christ* imputed, and not by our owne *workes*, which moved him first to loath the *popish* Doctrine, and to grow into suspicion and dislike of that *religion*. And in his *Commentary* on the *Galathians*, where he doth most highly extoll the *righteousnes* of *faith*, and debateth the *righteousnes* of *workes*, hee tels us, that *faith* being weake in many of *Gods* Children, cannot bee accepted for *righteousnes* of it selfe, that is, in a proper sense; and therefore there is necessarily required *imputation* of *righteousnes* for *iustification*, in *Gal. 3. 6.*

See further in the very wordes of *Luther* gathered out of his owne writings, and digested into common places by *Fabricius*, who cites the *same*, and page for
very

very word and sentence, which are these, first concerning justifying *faith*, he saith, *faith* obtaines what the *Law* commands; and what is that but *obedience* and *righteousnes*, 1 *Tom.* pag. 32.

And againe, by *Faith* *Christ* is in us, yea one body with us. But *Christ* is righteous and a fulfiller of Gods Commandements, wherefore wee all by him doe fulfill them, while *Christ* is made ours by *faith*, also *Tom.* 3. page 339. When *Paul* ascribes *iustificatio* to *faith*, wee mult of necessity understand, that hee speakes of *faith* laying hold on *Christ*, which makes *Christ* of efficacy against Death, sinne, and the *Law*: Also 2. *Tom.* pag. 315. *Faith* settles us upon the *workes* of *Christ* without our owne *workes*, and translates us out of the exile or captivity of our sinnes, into the Kingdome of his *righteousnes*. And *Tom.* 1. pag. 410. Sinne is not destroyed unlesse the *Law* be fulfilled.

But the *Law* is not fulfilled, but by the *righteousnesse* of *faith*: And page 437. To keepe the *Law*, is to have or possesse *Christ* the perfect fulfiller of the *Law*. And *Tom.* 4. Page 44. *Faith* *iustifics*, because it apprehendeth, and possesseth that treasure; viz. *Christ*. And Page 45. we say that *Christ* doth forme *faith*, or is the forme of *faith*. And *Tom.* 2. upon *Genesis*, The laying hold on the *promises* is called sure and firme *faith*, and doth justifie, not as it is our *workes*, but the *workes* of God. These speeches shew plainely, that *Luther* conceived *Christ* with his *righteousnesse* to bee after a sort the formall *righteousnesse* of the *believer*; though not formally inherent in him, yet formally possessed and enjoyed by *faith*. Concerning this justifying *righteousnes*, *Luther* also teacheth; that it is not in our selves, but in *Christ*, even his fulfilling of the *Law* for us made ours and imputed to us *Tom.* 1. page 106. By *faith* (*faith* hee) are our sinnes made no more ours but *Christs*, upon whom God hath laid the iniquities of us all, and he hath borne our sinnes: and on the other

ther side, all his *righteousnes* is made ours, for he layes his hand upon us. And page 178. The *righteousnesse* of a Christian is anothers *righteousnes*, and comes to him from without; it is even *Christ* who is made unto us of *God* *righteousnes*, so that a man may with confidence glory in *Christ*, and say, *Christ* his living, doing, and suffering, is mine no otherwise then if I had lived, done, and suffered as he did; as the *Married man* possesseth all which is his *Wives*, and the *Wife* all the goods which are her *Husbands*, for they have all things common, because *they are become one flesh*; and so *Christ* and the *Church* are one *Spirit*, by faith in *Christ*, *Christs* *righteousnes* is made our *righteousnes*, and all his are ours, yea, he himselfe is ours. And Tom. 2. page 86. The *righteousnes* by which we are *iustified* before *God*, is not in our owne persons, but without our selves in *God*, because man shall have no cause to be puffed up with an opinion of his owne proper *righteousnes* before *God*. And Tom. 2. page 385. A Christian is not formally *righteous*, by reason of any substance or quality in him, but relatively, in relation to *Christ* in whom he hath true *righteousnes*.

Melancthon in *Epist*, ad *Rom*. 8. 4. saith, wherefore *Pauls* meaning is thus to be taken; That *Christ* is given for us, that we may bee counted to have satisfied the *Law* by him, and that for him wee may be reputed *righteous*; Although we our selves doe not satisfie the *Law*, anothers fulfilling of it freely given to us, and is imputed to us, and so the *Law* is *imputatively* fulfilled in us, and so when the *Apostle* saith that *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every beleever*; that is, he that hath *Christ* is *righteous*, hee is reputed to have satisfied the *Law*, and hee *imputatively* hath that which the *Law* requires. And in chap. 10. 4. upon these wordes, *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness*, &c. he saith, this is the simple meaning: *Christ is the end: that is, the fulfilling of the Law to the beleever*, and

and he who hath *Christ*, that is, beleeveth in *Christ*, is *righteous*; and hath *imputatively* what the *Law* requires.

The Booke of concord, subscribed by so many hundred *Evangelicall Ministers* of the reformed *Churches* in *Germany*, in the Articles of *Iustification* faith, that when we speake of *iustifying faith*, it is to be knowne, that these three *objects* concur which are to bee beleev'd. 1. the promise of the benefit; that is, *mercy* for remission or *iustification*. 2. That the promise is most free; which excludes our *merits*. 3. The *merits* of *Christs* which are the *price* and *propitiation*, and a little after, *Faith* doth not *iustifie* because it is a worke worthy by it selfe; that is in a proper sense, but onely because it receives the *mercy* promised. And again how shall *Christ* be our *Mediatour*, if in *iustification* wee doe not use him for our *Mediatour*, that is; if we doe not feele, that for him we are reputed *righteous*.

The *Divines* of the *Augustin* confession cndemne *Osiander*, who held, that the *righteousnes* of *faith* was the essentiall *righteousnes* of *God*; And also them who taught, that *Christ* is our *righteousnes* onely according to his humane nature. And in the *Epitome* of the Articles controverted by some, they with one consent affirmed; that the *righteousnes* of *faith* is remission of *sinnes*, reconciliation on to *God*, and adoption to be *Sonnes* of *God* for the obedience of *Christ* only, which by *faith* alone of meere grace is imputed to all *believers*. *Articulo 3. de fidei iustitia*. And this obedience of *Christ* which is imputed for *righteousnes*, they affirme to be the obedience which hee performed both in his death and passion, and also in his fulfilling of the *Law* for our sakes. *Ibid. Artic. 3.* And concerning *faith* they teach, that in *iustification* before *God*, it trusteth neither in contrition, nor love, nor any other vertues, but in *Christ* alone; it is the onely meane and instrument which apprehends, and receives the free grace of *God*; the merit of *Christ* and remission of *sinnes*, and it resteth on *Christs* most perfect obedience.

By which he fulfilled the Law for us, which obedience is imputed to believers for righteousness, *Ibid. Artic. 3.*

Calvin is so zealous, and so cleere and manifest in teaching and maintaining the Doctrine of Justification: by the communion and imputation of Christs perfect obedience, satisfaction, and righteousness, that among Christians, Calvins Institutions, methinks, the very Father of lyers (the Devill himselve) should, if not blush and bee ashamed, yet in policy be afraid, to call Calvin for a witnesse against it, least all that heare him, should hate him and hisse him for his open lying.

The Doctrine of Calvin concerning justification, consists of these speciall Articles laid downe plainly.

1. *Instit. lib. 3. cap. 11.* First, hee affirms in plaine wordes, that Justification consists in remission of finnes, and imputation of Christs righteousness. *Sabb. 2.*

2. Secondly, he shewes what he meanes by remission of finnes, sometimes he takes remission of finnes in a large sense, for that act of God by which he doth communicate, and impute the full satisfaction of Christ unto his Elect and faithfull, that the whole guilt of all finnes, both of omission and commission is taken away, and they are no more accounted nor appeare in his sight as sinners: In this sense he calls remission of finnes totum iustificacionis, in his Comment on Rom. 4. and totam iustificacionem, whole iustification. *Instit. lib. 3. ca. 8. 4.* For indeed when the finnes of commission are taken away by that part of Christs satisfaction imputed, which is called, his passive obedience, or voluntary suffering of the penalties of the Law; and the finnes of omission by his active obedience in fulfilling the righteousness which the Law requires, which is the other part of Christs imputed satisfaction, so that the Elect are now reputed as righteous men, who have the defect which came by Omission supplied, and have no more the finnes of Omission imputed to them; this is perfect and whole iustification (as he truly calls it) But sometimes he useth the word, remission of finnes,

in a more strict sense, for that part of *Gods act* of communicating and imputing of *Christs satisfaction*, which respects the *passive obedience* of *Christ*, which takes away the guilt of *sinnes* committed, but doth not supply the omission of *righteousnes*, and in this sense he makes remission of *sinnes* but a part of *justification*, and *Gods* imputing of the active part of *Christs satisfaction* and counting the faithfull *righteous* by it imputed, hee makes the other part of *justification* in the wordes before cited out of his *Institutions lib. 3. cap. 11. Sect. 2.*

Thirdly, he constantly teacheth and affirmeth; that there is no *righteousnesse* by which a man can stand before *Gods Tribunal*, and be accepted for *righteous* in his sight, but onely the full *satisfaction* and perfect *righteousnes* of *Christ*, which he the *Sonne of God* performed in the nature of man, for that which is not intire and absolute, and without all staine and spot: (such as never hath beene, nor shall be found in any meere man) can never be accepted of *God*, but is with him sleighted and vilified beyond all measure; and whosoever prates of any *righteousnes* in mens owne *workes* or doings, they have no true thought, nor the least sense of the *justice* of *God*, but make a mock of it, *Instit. lib. 3. cap. 12. Sect. 1.* and 3. and 11. 26.

Fourthly, he affirmeth, that man is *justified* by faith, when he is excluded from the *righteousnes* of *workes*; & by faith layeth hold on the *righteousnes* of *Christ* with which he being clothed, doth appeare in the sight of *God*, not as a sinner, but as a *righteous man*. *Instit. lib. 3. cap. 11. Sect. 1.* And in the same chap. Sect. 11. He saith, *Hac est mirabilis iustificationis ratio, ut Christi iustitia tecti, non exhorreant iudicium quo digni sunt, & dum seipso merito damnant, iusti extra se censeantur.*

Fifthly concerning the Office of faith in *justification*, he teacheth, that faith being in it selfe weak and imperfect, and of no dignity or worth, price or value, is never able to *justify* as by it selfe, but by bringing *Christ*

unto us, who is given to us for *righteousnes*, it is not our *righteousnes*: but makes us come with the mouth of the soule opened, that we may be capable of *Christ*; and it is as a vessell or Pot; for as the pot full of money enricheth a man, so *faith* filled with *Christ* and his *righteousnes* is said to *justifie* us, and to be counted for *righteousnes*; and therefore he saith; that it is a foolish thing to mingle our *faith*, which is onely the instrument of receiving *righteousnes*, with *Christ* who is the *materiall cause*, and to h. the *Author* and *Minister* of this great benefit. chap. 11. Sect. 7. And in the 17. Sect. hee saith, that *faith* is hereupon said to *justifie*, because it doth receive and embrace the *righteousnes* which is offered in the Gospel.

6. Sixty he affirmes; that the *righteousnes* by which *believers* are *justified* and stand *righteous* before God, is, not in themselves but in *Christ*, even his perfect obedience and *righteousnes* communicated to them by *imputation* Sect. 23.

7. Lastly he sheweth how this *righteousnes* comes to bee the *righteousnes* of *believers*; and to bee so communicated to them, that God doth *justifie*: *impute* it to them for *justification*, and accept as if it were their owne; viz. by means of their *spirituall union*, and *communion* with *Christ*; by which they are made partakers of *Christ*, and with him and in him possesse all his riches. Sect. 10. and 20. and 23.

This is the sum of *Calvins* Doctrine concerning *justification*, briefly comprized out of his owne words, in places before cited, where the Reader may be fully satisfied.

Bea in the doctrine of *justification*, by *faith* doth perfectly agree with *Luther* and *Calvin* in all the former Articles.

First he saith; that *faith* is not any such vertue as doth *justifie* us in our selves before God, for that is to set up *faith* in the place of *Christ*: who alone is our whole and perfect *righteousnes*, but *faith* *justifies* as it is the instrument which receiveth *Christ*: and with him his *righteousnes*;

ousnes; that is; most full perfection; and we say that we are *iustificed* by *faith* onely, because it embraceth *Christ* who doth *iustifie* us: with whom it doth unite and couple us, that we may be partakers of *him* and all his goods, which being *imputed* to us, are sufficient that wee may be absolved before *God*, and deemed *righteous*; *Confess. cap. 4. Sect. 7. in notis Rom. 3. 22. 24.*

Secondly, that *faith* sends to *Christ* for perfect *righteousnes* to *iustification*, and that it assures us of *salvation*, through his *righteousnes* alone, because whatsoever is in *Christ*, is *imputed* to us, as if it were our owne, if so bee we embrace *him* by *faith*; and what the *righteousnes* of *Christ* is which is *imputed* to us, he fully expresseth and describeth to be that greatest and most absolute perfection of *righteousnes*: consisting in these two things. 1. That he hath no sinne in him. 2. That hee hath fulfilled all the *righteousnes* of the Law, *cap. 4. Sect. 58. in notis Rom. 3. 22. 26. and Rom. 4. 5. in Phil. 3. 9. Rom. 5. 12.*

Thirdly he sheweth; that we come to have communion with *Christ's* *righteousnes*: by *spirituall union* and marriage with *Christ*. If (saith he) we be united and joynd together into fellowship with *Christ* by *faith*, nothing is more proper ours, then *Christ*, and whatsoever is *Christ's*. *Confess. 4. Sect. 9.*

Fourthly he pronounceth, that it is no lesse then wicked blasphemy, to deny the *mutuall* and *reciprocall imputations* of the *sinnes* of true *believers* to *Christ*, and of *Christ's* *righteousnes* to true *believers*, in his booke of *iustification* against *Anonymus*.

Fifthly he affirmes; that *righteousnes* which *iustifies* men before *God*: must be both a full satisfaction for sinne; and also a perfect fulfilling of *Gods* *Commandements* in every part, in *Rom. 3. 20.*

Our learned *Whitakers* worke against *Campion*, in his answer to the 8. reason: page 38. and against *Durans*, lib. 8. page 176. 177. 182, 183. doth stoutly and pithily dispute and maintaine the Doctrine of *iustification*, by

the *righteousnes* of *Christ* imputed, which he proves to be the onely perfect *righteousnes*, able to *iustifie* us before *God*.

Master *Perkins* also; in his golden *Chaine* (called the order of the causes of *salvation* and *damnation*, chap. 37.) makes the translation of the *believers* *sinnes* to *Christ*, and of *Christ's* *righteousnes* to the *believer*: by a *mutuall* and *reciprocall* *imputation*, the forme of *iustification*.

Polanus, in *Synagmate theologico Lib. 6. Cap. 36.* doth maintain the same *Doctrine*, with *Lauber*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and *Whitaker*: and proves every point fully, by plaine testimonies, and invincible *Arguments*, out of the *holy Scriptures*. In his *Symphonia Catholica*, he brings testimonies of *Ancients*, affirming every Article of our *Doctrine*. And in his *Theses de iustifie.* he shewes the consent of *Orthodox Divines* of the reformed *Churches*.

And that *Adamsula*, *Iunius*, and other latter *Divines*, are grossely abused by him, who brings their testimonies to overthrow the *imputation* of *Christ's* *righteousnesse*, will plainly appeare, if any be pleased to reade *Adamsula* upon *Rom. 8. 34.* and *16. 3. 4.* where he expounds the *Apostles* wordes of the fulfilling of the *righteousnes* of of the *Law* in us, to be meant. First of all *imputatively* by the *righteousnes* of another, even of *Christ* which is also ours, *For we are flesh, of his flesh, &c.* And by the *righteousnes* of *God* he understands *Christ's* perfect *righteousnes* imputed to us.

Also *Iunius*, *Thes. 35.* and *36.* doth affirme, that the *righteousnesse* of faith imputed to *believers*, is the *righteousnes* which the *Law* requires, performed by *Christ*; differing onely in this, that *Legall* is every mans fulfilling of the *Law* in his owne person, but this *Evangelicall*, is the fulfilling of the *Law* by *Christ*, *God* and man our *surety* and *mediator*.

Thus have I vindicated the *Godly* learned, both *ancient*, and *modern Divines*, from the foule slander, most falsely laid

laid upon them, by this impudent *forger* of false witness: and by their owne manifest testimonies, I have made manifest their unanimous consent in the true Doctrine of *justification*, by the *righteousness* of *Christ*, *imputed* to *believers*, and of them apprehended, and applied by *faith*.

Now I leave it to all indifferent *Readers*, and zealous *Christians*, to consider, whether it be not their duty, both to take heed to themselves, and to admonish others, that they have no fellowship, with so openly profest *Socinian* *Sectaries* as this man, and his followers are: you see the *Doctrine* which they maintaine, is *wicked*, and *blasphemous Heresie*: And after many admonitions given by divers grave and learned *Divines*, and often publique *confutations*, and *censures*, passed in publique, they still *persist* in their *pestilent heresy*, &c. are more mad to *maintain* and *dispute* it then before; and when *truth* cannot helpe them, they flee for helpe to the Father of *lyers*, and make *lyes* their *refuge*, and in *forging* *lies* they *sinne*, being condemned of themselves, even against their *knowledge*, and *consciencie*; As the *Apostle* foretold concerning *Heresicks*, *Tim.* 3. 11. How wilfully against the knowne *truth*, and his owne *consciencie*, this desperate man, hath *Proclaimed* *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Musculus*, *Turnus*, and others, to be of his opinion, I have sufficiently proved; and if ever he did but looke into any of their writings, his owne eyes would have taught him how opposit they are to his *Heresie*.

As for his rude, impudent, and unmannerly followers, their ownelying and slanderous tongues, proclaime their pedigree from the Father of *liars*. Let this my answer be by way of *disputation*, and *confutation*, be a witness to free from the false reports which they have dispersed even among divers, who were eye and care witnesses, to the contrary, viz. That Mr. *Goodwin* did *confute* and *confound* me of late, when he came to performe the challenge made by him, or at least, boldly undertaken upon the

the request of his Disciples, who made and sent it to me, and did so mightily convince me, by the power of his *Arguments*, that first he made me rage through anger and fury, and after made both my Brother and me, to yeeld, and to confesse our former *ignorance*, and *errors*, and to embrace him as one sent from *God* to turne us from *darknesse* to *light*.

That I promised, and vowed, to renounce my former *Doltrine* of *justification*, if ever *God* would give me liberty, and to Preach his *Hereticall* opinion: that we besought *him* and all his *Followers* to joyne with us in thanksgiving to *God* for our *Illumination*, by their Divine Doctor; and in prayer for the *Grace* of *perseverance*, in the light received. These reports of us are in our eyes no other, then if they had reported, that *truth* was turned unto *falsehood*, and the Divell become the Father of *truth*: From such Spirits, the *God* of *truth*, defend his Church, and People, and grant a free passage to his Gospel, and to his faithfull *Ministers* a *Doore* of utterance, that they may Preach among all men every where, the unsearchable riches of *Christ*. To that *God* of *truth*, I consecrate my *tongue* and *pen*, and do resolve with both, to maintaine his *truth*, by his assistance and *grace*, so long as *life*, *breath*, and *strength* shall last: and to him give all *glory*, now and ever.

FINIS.
